

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THOSE WHO HAVE SERVED KNOW
WE MUST REMAIN STRONG

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if you were planning to erect a dike to hold back floodwaters from your property, you would be well advised to seek out one experienced in such matters and draw on his knowledge to insure that your dike would do the job that it is designed to do. Likewise, should a farmer face the loss of his livestock to predators, he would seek advice and counsel from friends and neighbors who had successfully dealt with similar threats.

The American Legion membership is made up of those who have proudly served their country in periods of national peril. Legionnaires have faced this country's enemies in two World Wars, the Korean war and the Vietnam war. They are experienced "dike builders"—they are the ones who have dealt successfully with the threats of "floodwaters" and "wild animals," whose purpose it was and is to destroy our country.

Those who have served know we must remain strong.

At their national convention in Atlanta, Ga., on August 26, 27, 28, 1969, the Legionnaires expressed grave concern over and vigorous opposition to, plans to reduce our military strength in the face of threats to our national security.

These veterans whose patriotism and loyalty is a matter of record are equally as concerned over attempts to downgrade the military and efforts to malign those of the industrial complex who have enabled our country to maintain its deterrent military strength.

The American Legion Convention Committee on National Security presented two resolutions on this subject which were unanimously adopted:

OPPOSE MILITARY REDUCTIONS

Whereas, it has been announced that Members of Congress have notified the Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird, that he will be required to:

1. Eliminate 100,000 men from the Armed Forces;

2. Deactivate 100 fighting ships of the U.S. Navy including the recently reactivated battleship *New Jersey*; and

3. Reduce some hundreds of thousands of flying hours from the U.S. Air Force; and

Whereas, the American Legion deplors this rash and hasty action and feels that this cannot be the will of the Congress; and

Whereas, the American Legion applauds the thought of the economy minded Congressmen but recommends that their efforts be directed to fields less hazardous to our national security; and

Whereas, the reports are prevalent that Russia is increasing the strength of its Mediterranean fleet; tensions increasing in the Middle East between Israel and Egypt; fighting continues on the borders between Russia and China; and

Whereas, despite every concession by our

country, the Paris negotiations have produced no meaningful discussions and despite our halt to the bombing in Southeast Asia, no reciprocal reduction of guerrilla attacks upon our forces have been made by North Viet Nam, and casualties continue to mount; and

Whereas, Castro remains only 90 miles from Florida and in other countries throughout the world are threatening peace and freedom; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Atlanta, Georgia, August 26, 27, 28, 1969, that they view with alarm this threat to reduce our military strength in men, ships and training and vigorously oppose such reduction, and be it

Further resolved, that the Congress study carefully any reduction in our Armed Forces which may endanger our national security.

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

Whereas, the strength of the nation depends not only on the number and quality of the men available to fight for it, but also upon the scientific, technological and productive capacity of the nation's industries; and

Whereas, a harmonious relationship must exist between the military and industrial organizations to design, develop and deploy necessary weapons systems in support of our national security; and

Whereas, in two world wars the United States helped bring victory to the free nations by serving as the "arsenal of democracy" because management and labor united in a vital contribution to the effectiveness of our gallant comrades in arms; and

Whereas, many statements regarding the "military-industrial complex" have been made to the citizens of our country in biased and undocumented form in the attempt to downgrade our national security posture; and

Whereas, no modern military power can be created or maintained without sophisticated and vast industrial productive capabilities; and

Whereas, through the investment of private capital, efficient management and loyal workers, the great industrial corporations of America doing research, development and production for aerospace, naval and ground forces as well as for our space program, are an indispensable national resource which would have to be created if it did not already exist; and

Whereas, the maligned military-industrial complex is composed of workers, technicians, scientists and managers, united in support of their brothers and sons serving our country in all our military forces; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Atlanta, Georgia, August 26, 27, 28, 1969, that we cannot accept any philosophy that would downgrade or destroy the private enterprise relationship between the military and industry that has made this nation great and has kept it free; and we express our unending gratitude to all who have contributed to the industrial efforts which have supported our armed forces in war and at times of international tension; and, be it

Further resolved, that we urge the press, radio and television media as well as others who attract public attention and help mould public opinion to make every reasonable effort to present to the American people a fair and undistorted picture of the essentiality of cooperative efforts between

our military forces and private enterprise so necessary to the survival of the nation and the protection of freedom throughout the world.

CLAUDE PEPPER HAS SEASONED
VIEWS ON CRIME

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the so-called "crime issue" is one that is on the minds of most persons in this country today. There are those who cry aloud, wring their hands, and do little to help alleviate this problem.

On the other hand, there are persons, such as the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Representative CLAUDE PEPPER, who quietly—and efficiently—work hard to solve this problem.

Those of us who have had the privilege of working with Mr. PEPPER know of his outstanding abilities, his capacity to work hard, and above all, his willingness to tackle tough problems and come up with sensible solutions.

Last week, Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, writing in the *Washington Star*, called attention to the outstanding work being done by Mr. PEPPER as chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime. I commend it to my colleagues for reading. CLAUDE PEPPER has served his country well, both in the Senate and in the House. Those of us who are concerned about crime owe Mr. PEPPER a note of thanks for the work he is presently undertaking on the problem of crime.

The *Washington Star* article follows:

CLAUDE PEPPER HAS SEASONED VIEWS
ON CRIME

Thirty years ago, when Claude Pepper was serving in the Senate, conservatives used to regard him with horror. He was a liberal's liberal, with a tabasco tongue and a fiery eye. In 1950, when defeat knocked him off, we shed no tears. But time has mellowed the old "Red" Pepper. He'll be 69 next week (September 9). He's now serving his fourth term in the House—one of only a few score men in history to serve first in the Senate and later in the House—and he's doing an especially able job in the field of crime and punishment.

With no further introduction, as they say on the chicken salad circuit, let me offer the floor to the gentleman from Dade County, chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime. He is thinking aloud on some dismaying truths that have emerged from six weeks of hearings:

"We didn't need these hearings for the purpose of discovering that crime exists. We all know too well that the fear of crime pervades the nation, and that political candidates are being elected on the law and order banner. The real message from our hearings is that despite this omnipresent fear and the public outcry for law and order, we are doing relatively little to meet the crime problem.

"A real paradox exists. While we all clamor for the control of crime, most actions that

must be taken are apparently among the lowest priorities for governmental action. During the past decade, juvenile crime has had an alarming increase out of all proportion with the increase in over-all crime. Arrests of juveniles for narcotics offenses has increased 800 per cent, yet Federal expenditures for juvenile delinquency prevention and control received a mere \$5 million appropriation last year.

"In a recent column touching upon the problem of recidivism in crime, you noted the shocking fact that many prisoners serve six or eight terms. We can agree, I'm afraid, that some of these are beyond even the best of training programs. We need to concentrate more effort on the first offender, developing some vocational as well as moral standards that will encourage him to go straight.

"Our nation has no national or sensible programs for corrections and rehabilitation. Our correctional programs are largely a relic of another age. They just do not correct. We have been told by many experts that youthful offenders would be better off—and so would society—if they were never caught. It is an abomination that a society that consecrates human values could permit the sordid and inhuman practices that take place in some of these institutions.

"There is no more important matter in the entire criminal justice system than the matter of corrections and rehabilitation. Until recently, the problem had been ignored by the federal as well as state and local governments. Now I understand that the administration is about to unveil a new proposal for the establishment of a national corrections program, apparently under the aegis of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, with the entire program being under the control of the Department of Justice.

"I have grave reservations. Perhaps the time has come for Congress to create a new independent agency which could focus entirely on new approaches in the area of corrections. Such an agency could lead the states, counties and cities out of the medieval grip of penology in which our local jurisdictions appear to be mired.

"I suppose that the heart of our difficulties in meeting the crime problem is symptomatic of what besets our society and our nation. We are confronted with the monumental national problem of determining priorities for federal action. The time for major corrective action is long overdue. The crime problem can be met only by resigning ourselves to a massive Federal effort involving a large Federal expenditure. Local communities have generally reached the limits of their financial resources. . . ."

The prospect of massive federal outlays in an area of state and local responsibility holds small appeal, but Pepper is plainly right. Those in Congress who holler most loudly of crime must back up their words with new infusions of money.

MISSOURI BEAUTY

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to those beautiful and talented Miss America pageant queens who were among a troupe of beauties who staged the third annual overseas "Miss America—USO Show" in Vietnam this summer.

I think it is especially fitting that they should be honored now following the selection of the new Miss America for 1970 in Convention Hall at Atlantic City this past weekend.

I am especially proud to point out that among the beauties who comprised the troupe in Vietnam was Miss Missouri for 1969, Miss Kathi Goff of DeSoto, in the Eighth Congressional District.

Miss Goff is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Russell E. Goff, Star Route West, DeSoto.

In the group which toured Vietnam for 22 days, besides Miss Goff, were Miss America, Miss Judith Anne Ford of Belvidere, Ill.; Miss Arkansas, Helen Rose Jennings; Miss Nevada, Sharon Jane Davis; Miss New Jersey, Linda Ann Wilmer; Miss New York, Patricia Burmeister; Miss Minnesota, Charlotte Ann Sims; and traveling companion, Mrs. Irene Bryant, official chaperone to Miss America.

The musical revue, "24 Hours a Day," featured group and solo numbers by the seven cast members.

Miss Missouri, Miss Arkansas, and Miss New Jersey are pop singers; Miss Nevada and Miss New York are classical singers; Miss Minnesota is a dancer; and Miss America is a champion gymnast and excellent dancer.

A willingness to entertain our servicemen in Vietnam, the desire to play their part in sustaining morale in Vietnam, the beauty and the talent—all this is worthy of commendation.

Miss Goff is most worthy of the honor, Miss Missouri.

WHERE OUR MONEY GOES

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government can find the most inane ways to spend money. The spot VISTA promotion for television is a prime example as the KOOL editorial shows:

In an editorial presented last month, we pointed out that the Federal Government spends some 400 million dollars a year on motion picture films, more than all the major Hollywood studios spend on feature films. We also pointed out that a good deal of this was wasted money.

Here's a prime example of that waste. In 1967, the Office of Economic Opportunity commissioned Sun Dial Productions of New York City to produce a 16 mm color film for use as a recruiting device for VISTA, Volunteers in Service to America. More than two-thirds of the film was shot in Allenville, telling the story of Allenville's struggle for a decent water supply, and how two young men entered into VISTA service to aid the cause. The remainder of the film was shot in Stanfield, Arizona. The cost of producing the thirty minute film was forty thousand dollars.

If that money had been applied towards correcting the problem, instead of exploiting it for propaganda purposes, Allenville could have had a new water system two years ago;

generous Arizonans would not have had to donate more than twenty-seven thousand dollars to match federal funds for a system, and the government could have saved about ten thousand dollars. Even worse, the film itself was not altogether truthful. However, the VISTA people in Washington are proud of the film and feel the taxpayers' money was well invested. They point out that it has been seen by more than two hundred thousand people.

We might point out that the thirty minute film we presented on this and the CBS Television stations in Tucson and Yuma did not cost the taxpayers a cent. It told the truth and was available to the television sets of the more than a million people who live in the coverage areas of the three Arizona stations that carried the film.

DR. MONTESSORI'S WAYS OF REACHING YOUNG MINDS

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in Italy early in this century, Dr. Maria Montessori, while she was doing advanced research in connection with her successful medical career, decided that her real vocation lay in teaching children.

The philosophy behind the methodology which she developed and which bears her name, is that children from birth to 6 years have a tremendous learning capacity, as well as an unusual and spontaneous urge to learn. The play materials and teaching methods that she developed take advantage of this learning instinct and desire.

Here in Washington, the New City School, using Montessori principles and operating in the parish hall of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, is endeavoring to bring these unique educational benefits to a diversified group of children in the inner city—to rich, poor, black, white, English-speaking, and non-English-speaking alike.

An account of this experiment, led by its director-teacher, Mr. Walter Hardesty, is given by Mr. Hardesty in the January-February 1969 issue of Southern Education Report. I include this article in the RECORD and recommend its careful review by my colleagues:

DR. MONTESSORI'S WAYS OF REACHING YOUNG MINDS

(By Walter Hardesty)

(NOTE.—Walter Hardesty, director-teacher of New City School, left a promising career in government to become a teacher of small children in 1964. He tells more about himself in this article.)

Maria Montessori, born in 1870, was the first woman to get the degree of doctor of medicine in Italy. But her reputation was in education. She established an approach to teaching children, especially the younger ones, that has borne her name over the decades.

In Washington, D.C., New City School is a new venture in Montessori teaching in an unusual neighborhood eight blocks from the White House. It is in the parish hall of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, just off Pennsylvania Avenue. Three blocks from the school,

the avenue passes into Georgetown, the exclusive restored section of the capital.

New City seeks to be a place where rich and poor, black and white, English-speaking and Spanish-speaking children can come together to work and learn. The school may seem at first glance to be in an unlikely setting. But within a block are some rather run-down streets. Within a few blocks are pockets of poverty the equal of impoverished areas anywhere in the city. This is one of the few spots in Washington where a neighborhood school is likely to draw a real mixture of races, economic levels and backgrounds.

Five of us have committed ourselves to New City School, betting our teaching talents and risking our incomes to find out whether a dream of faith and hope can become flesh and blood—or, as some might believe, whether it is just a wish-dream.

We are committed to taking half of our children from homes able to pay little or nothing toward the cost of their children's tuition, whether or not we can raise the scholarship money in advance. To make up the difference we are at present dependent on contributions from small organizations, such as churches, and from individuals. Because we are small ourselves, we do not have the extra measure of strength we would need to sell the city's board of education on supporting us. The board has turned down similar proposals in the past. Perhaps this will change soon; there now is a new board, chosen in November elections, the first elected school board in Washington in over half a century.

Already, raising money has become a critical problem. We have only one class going, but we have raised only four of the ten \$575 scholarships we need to pay the tuition of the poor. Next year will be tougher. Even before then we may have two classes going for children 2½ to 6½ years old. Lydia Mosher, who began her teaching with junior-high science and spent four years teaching it in District of Columbia public schools, may open our second class in February or March after she completes her Montessori training. And we hope to be adding three classes under the direction of Sanford Jones, who is to open our first class for children 6 to 9, Martha Jones and Elizabeth Hall.

Having pieced together some savings, a scholarship and some loans, these three are now doing advanced Montessori study in Italy. For the past five years, they have run their own school in suburban Annandale, Va. But they have found themselves spending more and more spare time in the city.

In 1966, Sanford founded a summer enrichment program for 25 inner-city children in the same room we now use as our first classroom. In 1968, he turned it over to Mrs. Mosher, a Howard University graduate who is an old hand in working with poor youngsters. Late afternoons and evenings Lydia and her husband, Peter, may often be found working with from two to two dozen youngsters in the Mosher basement. Next year, with all of us teaching, our total scholarship needs will be \$28,825.

What we want to do at New City is to try Montessori work with pretty much a public-school population. It is not exactly the same in every respect, though. Our children start at age 2½ instead of five or six. Toilet training is the only prerequisite. Another difference is that the parents choose our school, albeit for a variety of reasons. Some want their children to be with children a little different from themselves, feeling it is a part of learning. Some especially want Montessori schooling. Some come seeking a good school of whatever sort. Some mainly want to be free of the children for a couple of hours each day.

The parents do make a commitment, though, before the child is enrolled. They promise to feed the children and get them to and from school, for we provide only a light snack and no transportation at all.

But once the child is in, we try not to eliminate him for his parents' failures. Two children regularly arrive hungry and have to be given a light breakfast in spite of their mother's assurances that she is going to feed them every morning. In November, when the weather got a bit chilly, the same two boys stopped coming. The mother felt they could not stand the four-block walk in the cold, and had a very legitimate concern about the responsibility of the older brothers and sisters charged with accompanying them. We were able to arrange transportation with a generous parent of another child who was willing to stop by for them.

Like all Montessori schools, ours is non-graded. Children two to six work together in our first classroom. Interestingly enough, nongraded classes beginning at age 2 were part of a recent prescription to remedy Washington's school problems. The study, completed over 18 months ago by Dr. Harry Passow of Columbia University for the board of education, gave us more than a little satisfaction. We hope we will be able to do something that the school system will find valuable when it is ready to move in this direction.

While Dr. Montessori was doing advanced medical studies with children she concluded that her real vocation was teaching children. Working more from her own fresh observations than from textbooks or educational theories, she carved out a new understanding of the child. From this understanding she created an elaborate group of materials for the child to use in learning, and she devised a complementary set of teaching techniques for introducing the materials to the pupil.

Dr. Montessori's approach recognizes the power to learn and the urge to learn of the very young. It is as up-to-date in this respect as the contemporary work of Jean Piaget, J. McV. Hunt, and Jerome Bruner. Montessori said the child from birth to 6 has an absorbent mind, with capacities that are different from those of the adult. Witness the child's facility for learning language—his own or any to which he is exposed. The doctor noticed how the child accomplished this prodigious feat, how he did this extremely difficult work, without strain. No adult can duplicate it.

At the same time, she appreciated the child's weakness and dependence. She recognized that the child cannot absorb, cannot make apart of himself something to which he is not exposed. He is still dependent on parents or teachers or recreation workers for the range and variety of experience available. What we do not make available he cannot use.

The Montessori experience is that the little ones can take in—eagerly want to take in—far more than we give them in most homes and schools.

What we give, then, and how much we give are very important. But even more crucial is how we give it. We would not expect, for example, that the little child would learn to speak French in the manner of the university student (though the university student could do worse than approach French more in the manner of the child). Given this, we can guess that there will be big differences in the way the small child approaches and can receive the process of addition, in the way he comes to master writing.

The Montessori materials with which we work are the creation of a lifetime of effort by a woman who had an enormous gift for putting what the child wanted to learn into a form he could explore and exploit. Any parent who has had to put to bed a tired but kicking and resisting infant knows how urgently he wants to see, hear, smell, taste, touch and manipulate his environment in as many ways as he possibly can. Our materials are intended to give the child a constructive outlet for all of this.

In our classroom, the materials the child

uses provide what he wants and what he can absorb from a wide range of human activities. In working with these things, the child finds he has keys for developing his understanding of the larger world beyond the classroom. For example, take the Montessori bells. They sound the familiar eight notes: *do, re, mi . . . do*, beginning with middle C. When the child is ready, the sharps and flats are added.

The preschool child's experiences with the bells provide a key to the understanding of music, of the structure of musical language. Starting on this only a few years later, at the age of 7 or 8, a child would no longer have the same capacity to internalize his experience, to make it so completely a part of himself. Like the bells in music, the sandpaper letters, which are large letters cut out of sandpaper and mounted on cardboard, give the child one of the keys he needs for breaking the code of the written language and relating it to the spoken language he already knows.

Watching the great wealth and variety of work in a well-run Montessori program, one is reminded of the films of such schools as Florida's Nova School [SOUTHERN EDUCATION REPORT, March-April, 1966], where 30 or 40 children of different ages and with different interests work in almost as many different projects as there are children, all in the same room and all at the same time.

Even so, for many reasons, Montessori work is not a panacea. A Montessori class does not take the place of a good home. One child at New City School comes from a home where he obeys because he fears a beating. He is 4½. When he first came, he spent most of his time disrupting the other children. When I picked him up to extract him from his mischief, he started swinging at me. I said, "Nobody is going to hurt you here," and he relaxed. Now he doesn't swing on me anymore, and when we are sitting around reading a story he heads for my lap or that of my assistant, Tom Lennon. A child like this one at age 4½ requires constant attention from an adult during his first three or four months at school. Unless the school is fortunate enough to afford him that kind of special handling, he may have to be dropped, or the teacher may have no choice but to use the same approach used at home.

Neither is the Montessori classroom a substitute for a good playground, or a neighborhood lot, or just a back yard or alley where children can come together and play with one another. Where these things fail or are not part of the environment, something like a playschool is needed.

One little girl who came to me where I taught last year was quite intelligent, but never became as fully absorbed in her work as she might have. She had little opportunity to be with children outside the school and was just too excited with the chance to play and talk. Ideally a school would meet the needs of children both for learning and for play experiences. In practice, many Montessori schools confine their work largely to the schooling, that particular part which they do best.

At New City we may offer a limited day-care program to a few of our children beginning next fall if we can arrange it. Dr. Montessori's first school, in the poor San Lorenzo quarter of Rome, was for the children and is very much admired by those who especially care.

Since Dr. Montessori began her work with poor children and is very much admired by those especially concerned with the poor, such as Frank Reissman, author of *The Culturally Deprived Child*, how is it that Montessori is so middle-class now? In the Washington area, for example, only about 50 of 1,500 children in Montessori schools come from economically poor homes.

Wealthier people seem to have seen some-

thing they wanted, and they had the means to get it. The poor have not known about the opportunity, or could not afford it if they did. Partly this is because opportunities are not equal in our society. The capabilities of our public schools are not what we wish they were.

At New City School, we can do a little to set right these large-scale wrongs. We work from the Montessori approach because it seems to us the best means of giving these children, middle-class or poor, a key part of what they need.

All of us started from backgrounds other than early childhood education. Sanford and Martha Jones were concert pianists and music teachers. Elizabeth Hall was a member of the founding faculty of the New School for Music Study in Princeton and developed and directed a music readiness program for young children there from 1960 to 1964. Lydia Mosher's university major was botany and she taught science in Washington's public schools. I did management work with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration before going into preschool teaching, and then to Montessori.

Persons from professional education backgrounds as well have come to an appreciation of Montessori. One such person was a teacher named Ilene Detlor, whose training was in early childhood education at American University. When she came to work with us in a little school we had started for poor children before Head Start was available, we thought she was great, but she became very discouraged about her teaching in her second year after we installed a Montessori teacher in the next classroom. Ilene came to admire greatly the Montessori teacher's work. As Ilene put it, Sandra Sklar "knew where to take a child. . . . She knew how to make the most of the child's interest. . . . To a two-year-old, everything is a game, anyway, so why not give him an enormous amount of information in the games he plays?"

Ilene felt so strongly about trying to teach without Montessori training that she has dropped out of teaching until she can arrange to get the training. She can make an excellent Montessori teacher because she is also aware of some of the pitfalls in Montessori work. She points out that if the teacher feels pressured to "get Montessori results," it doesn't work. It is true that children in our schools often display spontaneously a surprising maturity, but the teacher who insists that the child begin by behaving like an adult is about as likely to get good results as is the psychologist or minister whose counsel to the troubled soul is, "Just be serene and wise."

At New City School we, like each teacher wherever he is, employ our training in a unique situation. Since our training was at the Washington Montessori Institute where most teachers are preparing to work with middle-class children, the poorer children provide the best test of our ingenuity and imagination in adapting the work to their style of learning.

Not that Montessori work is intrinsically better suited to the wealthier. At some points it seems better suited to the poor. For example, the poor, who in our case are all black children (as are about half of our middle-class children), seem to get more freely and directly involved than middle-class children. This works out beautifully for the poor because we work from the experience to verbalizing about it. And it is from manipulating real objects and working with each object many times and in different ways that the child forms in his own mind the concepts, the abstractions, that are built into the materials.

For example, the child who has worked out a pretty good understanding of the numbers from 1 to 10 and can read the corresponding symbols can be shown one tiny round

bead that makes "one unit." A string of 10 of these beads on a straight wire makes "one ten." A row of 10 of these strings forms a square, "one hundred." Ten of the squares together make a cube, "one thousand." If he has several of each category in front of him and if he has learned that the tiny bead is "one unit" and the big cube is "one thousand," the child can as easily get "five thousands" as he can "five units." In addition he can soon read the number 5,000 because he has now had a concrete experience that makes it meaningful. The thousands are just the ones with three zeroes after, the hundreds the ones with two zeroes, and so on. His next step is to read 5,672, which he reads as "five thousands, six hundreds, seven tens and two units." And this he matches with the actual quantities of beads.

The concreteness of what we do, which fits well with the learning style of all children but especially with that of the poor, might lead one to think the poor child has the edge. But there is a hitch. Unlike the middle-class child, he has had few or no experiences that give him any reason to get into the learning of the numbers 1 to 10 in the first place. Even if he counts aloud from one to ten, which he may have learned from skipping rope, he is slow to match the words to concrete objects.

In math and language work, conceptualizing and verbalizing are indispensable. The distinction is clearer if we note that in doing the practical tasks involved in caring for the room, in polishing the bells, in sweeping, or in pouring milk at snack, all tasks requiring minimum verbalizing, the poor child has no handicap. Unless his home life is unstable, he is the most apt child in this type of work.

Just the other day, one of the younger children wet his pants. Tom and I were both engaged with other children so we referred the problem to an older child, a boy of 4½ years from one of the poorer homes. He assisted the other fellow in a very professional way, checking with me again to let me know that the socks were wet, too, and the bag of dry clothes I had given him was without socks.

We are still left, though, with the problem of helping the poorer child get into the work that requires verbalizing and conceptualizing. Here we are working from two directions. First, we go ahead with the work the child can do well and enjoy. Again, this is the practical work. Polishing badly tarnished silver, for example, produces a big improvement. This type of work involves the child and heightens his capacity for concentration. It also introduces the child to the notion of getting a result through a sequence of operations, a notion equally useful in writing a word as a sequence of sounds.

The second way of approaching the economically poor child with the concept-building materials is to work through the middle-class child. The poorer child becomes interested as he observes the activity of the middle-class youngster who does these more academic things more eagerly. Before long, he comes to want to do them himself, and asks the other pupil or one of us adults to show him or let him help.

Cross-fertilization occurs in both directions. Often, a middle-class child, especially one who is verbal beyond his power to understand, or is hyperactive, or is given over too much to withdrawal into fantasy, gets a good lesson in settled work on a practical task from a poorer classmate. In this instance, the middle-class child is very much helped because his problem is that he cannot do anything much so long as he remains unsettled.

We make still another adaptation of Montessori materials and techniques in doing the language development work in ways that meet the unique preparation and style

of the poorer children. Occasionally this seems to bring us into conflict with the Montessori method narrowly conceived.

For example, the best Montessori classes develop a remarkable capacity for the enjoyment of quiet order in which 30 or so youngsters are working at individually selected projects or in groups of two or three with only occasional direction from the teacher. At New City School, where this sort of quiet is just beginning to come after several months work, the quiet may be punctuated with the near-shouting of a child who is learning which is a *big* cube of pink tower, which is a *bigger* one, and which is the *biggest* of all. The child may be responding to Tom Lennon's urging to "say it louder."

Tom is doing this because we have found that a child who cannot or will not learn the words at all if he hears and speaks in a quiet voice will work with gusto when the volume is turned up. We got the idea of doing it louder after reading about the work of Carl Berelter and Siegfried Englemann at the University of Illinois. (See "Tupelo Follows Through," Page 22.)

Another way of helping the poorer child to reach the takeoff point in language is special use of our games with the parts of speech. In one, the preposition game, the child puts the toy pig at the trough, the chair on the table, the picture across from the mirror, or whatever. With the middle-class child, who already knows a lot about the structure of the majority dialect, these games may sometimes be done only as reading work after he begins to read. In contrast, the poorer child may require lots of preparation before he is ever asked to give the proper response in playing the game aloud.

Those of us doing Montessori work are convinced of its value to the child in his struggle to make himself a man. At the same time, we recognize that a large-scale application of the work around the country is not possible at this stage.

We are working by bits and pieces to make Montessori advantages available to children whose families cannot pay for it. At New City there is no charge for children from families of three or more children with less than \$5,000 annual income. This is not rock-bottom poverty, but neither is it much to live on in a large city.

There are a few other schools trying to do much the same thing we are doing. One is the Midtown Montessori School, which two other teachers and I got going in Washington last year. Another is St. Paul the Apostle School in New York City. A third, operated by the Day Care Association of Atlanta, may have had to close for lack of funds by the time this article is printed.

In Atlanta, a new teacher-training operation has opened this year under the direction of Margaret Stephenson, who is considered the foremost authority on Montessori in the United States. It complements the work of the Washington Montessori Institute and other training centers in California and in Philadelphia. Even so, the number of teachers trained this year will be only about 130. This report does not cover teachers trained by nonaccredited "Montessori" training courses or the schools that employ these teachers, some of whom are quite capable but many of whom are not thoroughly prepared.

If more Montessori schools for the poor can open, we will soon have enough children that experimental situations can be created and some valid research done to measure the effects of our work.

Of the 130 new teachers available next year, very few will find jobs, in the South or elsewhere working with disadvantaged children. Many more could be attracted by the right kind of opportunity, for many each year express great concern for the children from

less fortunate circumstances, but few find such a possibility. Perhaps some situations could be established in housing projects, or as a part of existing day-care programs.

As the new teachers go out, they will do well to avoid the pitfalls into which some of us have fallen in the past. One pitfall is to be impatient. We have seen excellent results achieved by children working with more experienced teachers—teachers whose understanding had worked its way from their brains into their flesh and blood and bones. In our urgency to do great things too, we are likely to be impatient, with our children and ourselves, in getting the children to do what we know they are capable of. Ironically, in focusing too much on the end to be achieved, we break up the process which makes it possible. We pressure the children to act like Montessori children before they are Montessori children. We forget that an able teacher and a stable population of children should be expected to show developed Montessori work only after three years or more.

Another common mistake we make in Montessori practice is to take too narrow a view of our work. We see ours as the most comprehensive and widely practiced way of meeting the needs of the young child's mind, and a case can be made that it is. But this does not mean that other approaches have no contributions to make.

A close look at the work of O. K. Moore and his talking typewriters, or of Bereiter and Engelmann in developing verbal abilities of disadvantaged children 4 and 5 years old, or of Martin Deutsch in developing comprehensive approaches to teaching poor children in New York City, turns up little we Montessorians can quarrel with. We share the same experience of the astonishing learning powers of the child and we have a common commitment to providing him the means to develop himself. Appreciating and understanding the work of these people or of just plain good teachers in local public and private schools will deepen and enrich our own work.

Some of the pitfalls into which we slip may be unique to situations in which we try to work with the poor. Many of us are not prepared for it, by background or experience. Few of us are from poor backgrounds ourselves. Margaret Stephenson suggests to many middle-class trainees concerned about the poor that they first work three or four years with middle-class children as preparation.

Perhaps here a solution is for a few local communities to plan, with the advice of a Montessori consultant, to establish and fund a pilot program. Each community could choose, ideally, two or three local persons gifted in working with children and teaching and could sponsor them in the training course. Perhaps men would be better than women, because when a man gets married and raises a family he does not interrupt his career. And perhaps younger persons without previous teacher training and experience, other things being equal, might make better choices. In her first project in Rome, Dr. Montessori chose as an assistant a young woman of 17, who was open to a new way of doing things.

Not long after Maria Montessori began her work with the children in that slum tenement that housed her first Children's House, those who came to observe from over the world went away talking of the "new" children. Dr. Montessori had been offered the job of working with them by a building manager who wished to keep the children busy doing something other than damaging his property. She had tried her first experiments in teaching them to read in response to the appeals of the children's illiterate parents. From this start grew a great life work.

Our children are living in a different place, a different time, and a different culture. Nevertheless, Montessori's work has much to teach us that we can use in giving the child,

whatever his background, what he needs to take his place as a man in 20th Century America.

A BETTER ALTERNATIVE TO REVENUE SHARING

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would create a new instrument to expand Federal financial assistance to our hard-pressed cities and States. The Federal Government is already helping, of course, through its categorical grant-in-aid program, now costing about \$25 billion a year.

This program is overcomplicated. It needs to be simplified and modernized to be more responsive to the needs of our communities. But it is, and is likely to remain, the backbone of the Federal assistance effort.

The new instrument we are seeking would be a supplement to this grant program. President Nixon has proposed a system of revenue sharing that would return about \$500 million in Federal tax revenues to the States in its first year of operation, fiscal 1971. This figure would rise to about \$5 billion a year by the middle of the 1970's.

I have grave reservations about this plan for several reasons. Most importantly, I do not favor another direct handout from Washington. This approach can only serve to make the States and cities more dependent than ever on the Federal Government. What we must do is establish a new system that will motivate State and local governments to become more self-reliant, more in control of their own resources.

I am introducing today a bill that would achieve this goal. I propose to institute a tax-credit system that would allow the taxpayer to claim 40 percent of the income taxes he pays to State and local governments against the tax bill he owes to Washington.

This effective reduction in Federal income taxes would ease the competition for the taxpayers' dollar now faced by State and local government. These governments could then pick up the added revenues in their tax schedules at no extra cost to the taxpayer.

At the same time, we would maintain the basic integrity of our fiscal structure and strengthen the present shaky partnership among the Federal, State, and local governments.

There are many other persuasive arguments for adopting this alternative approach to revenue sharing. A number of these are set out in an excellent paper appearing in a recent issue of the "Virginia Law Weekly." The author of this paper, Mortimer M. Caplin, is a distinguished former Commissioner of Internal Revenue and Virginia Law School professor of tax and corporate law. Mr. Caplin is currently in private law practice in Washington. I commend his argument to the attention of the Congress:

CAPLIN SUGGESTS REFORM IN STATE TAXATION POWER

(By Mortimer M. Caplin)

One of these days, the war in Vietnam will come to an end. At that happy time, the nation is expected to turn its gaze upon itself and set about the task of healing internal wounds long left to fester. Close and careful reexamination will be inevitable for much of our domestic policy and policy-making apparatus, including our tax system.

In recent years, tax reform proposals of many sorts have already begun to proliferate—some with widespread roots and ramifications, and reaching into areas that have little ostensible relation to tax policy in the narrow sense. Examples are found in the "new economics," with the enactment of short range tax rate changes to counteract fluctuations in our national economy; investment credits to induce private business to modernize its machinery and equipment; a variety of income tax incentives aimed at encouraging the private sector to help solve our many urban problems. Such proposals testify to the conviction of economists, tax experts, and political scientists, that tax policy will be a major force in pointing the direction of new domestic programs in the post-Vietnam period.

The prevalence of this conviction is hardly surprising. The end of the war should free up not only our national attention but a great deal of potential revenue, which could be allocated in an almost infinite variety of ways. Our decisions on how and in what amounts to make these tax allocations will reflect revealingly our national values and our felt priorities among the many competing goals to be achieved in the 1970's.

PREDICTS ROLE QUESTIONING

Perhaps first on the list of domestic concerns will be questions on the respective roles to be assumed by federal, state, and local governments. Currently we are experiencing a widespread attitude of doubt over the omniscience and omnipotence of the federal bureaucracy. Creative federalism, it seems, will soon be in vogue (again), if it is not so already. And, of course, tax policy must figure prominently in any comprehensive thinking along these lines.

It is no secret that state and local governments are today experiencing a crisis of revenue, and that even the relatively modest functions they now fulfill are being placed in jeopardy. If, as talk from many quarters would indicate, the post-Vietnam tendency is to be toward fragmentation of national problems—toward state and local handling of "local" problems—the fiscal squeeze in the states must be diagnosed and eased. State and local governments must be placed on a sounder financial footing to permit them, not only to solve their present problems efficiently, but to take on the new tasks to be assigned to them.

DISCUSSES TAX POLICY

To achieve this goal, it is only natural to look to the enormous revenue-raising potential of the federal government. Placing a portion of this potential at the service of the states would be the logical consequence of the proposed shift of responsibilities to them from the federal government.

I have elsewhere maintained that "our tax laws are fundamentally a mechanism for raising revenue; we should be sparing before we use them for any other purpose—whether for regulatory purposes or to accomplish social and economic objectives." Caplin, *Federal Tax Policy—The Need for Reform*, 56 Georgetown L.J. 880, 889 (1968). I still subscribe to that view. But now as then, I favor use of our tax laws to achieve nontax goals when two preconditions are met: (1) the objective is one of over-riding importance to our society, and (2) it is one whose achievement can be most effectively realized

through the tax mechanism. Implicit in this second condition are the requirements that tax incentives should be better able to achieve the desired result than alternative governmental programs, and that they should be able to accomplish this result without substantially higher costs or waste of resources.

REVIEWS TRADITIONAL AID

Our present system of taxation (and spending) at the federal level takes into account the legitimacy of the financial needs of the states and their subdivisions. But traditional tax and spending aids to the states have always produced a certain uneasiness. In recent years, they have come in for increasing criticism, and it seems unlikely that they will be adequate for raising state and local revenues to desired post-Vietnam levels. The conviction seems to be growing that these devices are too costly, too inefficient, and less effective than other alternatives which are available, though yet untried.

Traditionally state and local governments have been given fiscal assistance in three principal ways: (1) the federal income tax exemption for interest on state and municipal bonds, (2) the deduction for state and local taxes, and (3) the system of outright federal grants for specific purposes (so-called categorical grants).

NOTES ABUSE IN BOND FINANCING

Unfortunately, exempt bond financing, a primary tool of revenue raising at the local level, has been abused. A trend has developed in recent years for state and local governments to place their exempt bond power at the disposal of private business concerns—by first issuing bonds, then using the proceeds to build industrial plants, and finally selling or leasing the plants to businesses for a price that reflects the lower interest rate paid by the state or municipality. As Assistant Treasury Secretary Surrey has pointed out, such industrial development bond financing presents the enormous disadvantage of costing the federal government more in lost revenue—from tax-free interest in the hands of otherwise high-bracket taxpayers—than the after-tax savings achieved by the private concerns through lower lease costs and lower purchase prices (taking into account, too, lower income tax deductions).

CITES ALTERNATIVE PLAN

The Heller-Pechman proposal is, in my judgment, a fairly novel and radical one. Perhaps the best way of bringing out its strengths and weaknesses is to set forth briefly an alternative plan devised for some, but not all, of the same purposes. I refer to the proposal studied at some length by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations involving a federal income tax credit for income taxes paid to states (and perhaps to local governments). A similar plan has been supported by the Committee for Economic Development.

The Commission's analysis, as contained in its *Report on Federal-State Coordination of Personal Income Taxes*, starts with the conclusion that the states have need of a tax source with strong revenue growth potential in an expanding economy. For many reasons—principally tax fairness, aid to the poor, flexibility, and freedom from tax competition among the states—the income tax would be a very logical source. In addition, income taxes remain today the largest virtually untapped source of state and local revenues. The difficulty, however, is with the already noted federal presence in the income tax area, which has caused hesitation among state and local policymakers to consider an income tax. In the Commission's view, this presence is so overwhelming that it induces states to look elsewhere for revenue.

ENCOURAGES STATE TAXATION

With an eye to encouraging state-local adoption of income taxes, the Commission urges the federal government to take a large

step toward permitting states to choose freely among the various available tax sources. This would take the form of a federal income tax credit of some 30 to 50 percent of income taxes paid at the state and local levels. (The credit would be optional, with the federal deduction of 100 percent of state-local income taxes paid still being available to taxpayers whose marginal tax rates exceed the 30 to 50 percent figure.) The credit would reduce the net income tax payable to the federal government and the states would thereby be stimulated to pick up the difference by raising their own income tax rates.

The potential of more funds for state-local use is only partly the purpose of the credit. State and local taxes are already deductible in computing federal income taxes, and in recent years this deduction has been equivalent to an average credit of some 25 percent. The Commission estimates that the additional cost (above the nearly \$1 billion cost of the present deduction) to the United States Treasury would approximate only \$1 billion. But the income tax credit would, in the Commission's view, have a tremendous psychological and political impact. By distinguishing state-local income taxes from all other forms of taxation—and by giving such taxes a high degree of visibility through lower federal income tax liability—the credit would permit a state to make a thoroughgoing review of its tax policy. An ultimate aim would, of course, be to induce more states to adopt income taxes as the principal means of raising their revenue. If this were achieved, the total amounts collected by the states under the optional credit system could readily approach the \$6 billion now cited as the result of the Heller-Pechman plan.

It is obvious that these two plans—revenue sharing and state income tax credits—have almost no superficial features in common, although the general goals of both are similar: to place the states and local governments on sound financial footing now and for the unpredictable variety of tasks that lie ahead. With both proposals going off in other directions in some of their aspects, what can be said of the merits of one plan as against the other?

PREFERS TAX CREDITS OVER REVENUE SHARING

My own inclination is to regard the tax credit device as more traditional, more familiar to tax legislators, more readily acceptable to Congress from a budgeting standpoint, and, for these reasons, more practicable. Use of a tax credit as an incentive to foster particular activities is, after all, a concept that has appeared numerous times in the history of federal taxation. The existing foreign tax credit is merely one example. Moreover, the tax credit here proposed is more in line with traditional concepts of states' rights and independence than the Heller-Pechman plan. Under the credit device there would truly be no strings attached to the new revenue flowing into state and local coffers. There would be almost total independence from the federal government in revenue planning and revenue use.

The credit plan, therefore, has great political appeal—despite the ironic fact that it benefits low income states (whose Congressional contingent might be strongly attracted to the states' rights doctrine) far less than the Heller-Pechman plan, which clearly involves a redistribution of revenue wealth among the states. Also, the credit device bears the esthetic (and perhaps too idealistic) feature of carrying through to its logical end an apparently growing belief—that states and local governments should begin to bear the principal burden of handling and resolving domestic problems that beset the nation. Finally, this plan would (1) allow for differences among the states with respect to particular local needs and (2) permit relatively

simple adjustments at the state level to meet any special or sudden crisis or condition.

Finally, the deduction for state and local taxes is criticized for being ineffective as a relief against the sales tax, which for the poor is the most onerous of all state and local taxes. This tax is paid in such small bits and scraps that taxpayers can rarely show how much they have actually expended in the course of a year. Although the Internal Revenue Service provides tables for a state-by-state approximation of sales taxes paid, the estimates consistently tend to be on the conservative side.

As for the system of categorical grants, there are few subjects in the entire area of inter-governmental relations that can arouse such emotion. Detractors contend that, like all handouts, federal grants fail to encourage initiative and independence at state and local levels. Since the more than 400 federal grants generally require monies to be spent for specific purposes—subject to various conditions including periodic accountings—the further point is made that these grants involve too much federal interference with state and local programs. And then, the federal grant system—currently involving distributions in excess of \$15 billion each year—is a cumbersome one for the federal government (especially Congress) to handle. It involves constant administration and frequent revision, and constitutes a great incentive for Congressmen to spend a large part of their time in the rolling of logs.

True, all the returns on categorical grants are not yet in—and it may be too early to consider their discard in favor of a smoother and more efficient mechanism. Also, in some areas today, close federal supervision of state and local government is critically necessary. But it seems clear that a categorical grant system cannot do the entire post-Vietnam job. From a fiscal point of view, such a system is the very antithesis of the political philosophy that would encourage independence and innovation at state and local levels. In brief, the notion of expanding the categorical grant system—thereby further complicating the administration of this system—is not a very appealing one.

If state and local governments are to handle effectively their present tasks and yet assume new duties—in the areas of urban problems, poverty, violence and crime, housing, education, job-training, transportation, airports, pollution, and so forth—they will need other tools. Means to raise revenue, efficiently and without undue delay as widely varying needs become apparent, must be made available. Prevailing types of federal aid to state and local governments are not directed toward this goal, while many of the reform proposals made in recent years are. Two of these proposals, very different in some major respects, are of special interest.

One, a revenue sharing plan, has been supported by two eminent authorities on federal taxation and fiscal policy, Walter W. Heller and Joseph A. Pechman. The proposal is concisely outlined in a little booklet published by the Brookings Institute and entitled *Questions and Answers on Revenue Sharing*. Briefly, the proposal runs as follows: the federal government would distribute 2 per cent of its individual income tax base to the states on a permanent basis. In other words, two percentage points in each tax bracket would be collected by the federal government on behalf of the states. The remaining 12 to 68 percentage points would continue to be allocated on the federal level. Since the federal individual income tax base, by itself, is currently in excess of \$300 billion, the proposal would result in at least \$6 billion of distributable funds, even if (as the authors propose) the corporate income tax base is not taken into account.

These sums would be held in trust, similar to payroll taxes for social security purposes and motor vehicle and gasoline taxes for the

highway program. The trust funds would be regularly distributed to the states on a per capita basis (although the authors would allow for some modification of this formula to provide higher payments to states with low populations and a high incidence of poverty). The distribution would be, in the authors' terms, with "few strings" attached, although there would be some requirements for the states to fulfill. In particular, the revenue-sharing formula would include some provision for a portion of these funds to be passed through to local governments. Moreover, the states (and probably the local governments) would be charged with submitting annual audits on the monies received, as well as assurances that all applicable federal laws, such as the Civil Rights Act, have been complied with in the activities financed with these funds. Finally, the distributions to the states would be for their general purposes, as determined by them, except that the funds could not be used for purposes covered by categorical federal grants already in existence.

A relatively new section of the Internal Revenue Code, § 103(c) (signed on June 28, 1968), has attacked the most egregious abuses in this area by simply withdrawing the exempt status of interest on state-municipal obligations issued for the direct or indirect benefit of a private business. But the statute does not apply in many situations, and, in particular, not to obligations "issued as part of an issue, the aggregate face amount of which is \$1 million or less, and substantially all of which are to be used . . . for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, or improvement of land or property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation." As Surrey has noted in commenting upon this section, "the ability to issue blank checks up to \$1 million is still a nice thing in this world." Further, an even newer section of the Code (signed on October 24, 1968) would permit tax-free interest for state-municipal industrial bond issues of up to \$5 million, provided that certain additional qualifications are met.

CRITICIZES DEDUCTIONS POLICY

The deduction for state and local taxes is disadvantageous for different reasons. First of all, this deduction is only available to federal taxpayers who itemize their deductions. Because of this, the deduction is virtually lost upon many wage earners, especially in low income groups, who tend not to itemize. Moreover, because the deduction is available for numerous types of state and local taxes, it is criticized by some as failing to guide the states toward one type of tax—namely, the income tax.

Among commentators with less of a preference for the income tax, it is recognized that the highly visible federal presence in the income tax area makes it both psychologically and politically difficult for states to choose this type of tax. For this reason, they argue persuasively that the federal deduction for state and local taxes should at least seek a neutral position among competing tax sources—by (1) granting tax advantages to state and local income taxes and (2) thus dispelling to some extent the cloud hanging over this type of tax at state and local levels. Support for this position is obviously based upon the conviction that the income tax—even if not necessarily the best type of tax in all situations—is a highly desirable and fair tax, and one that is readily adaptable to state and local needs.

QUESTIONS INVASION OF STATE CHOICE

On the negative side, the credit proposal is subject to the charge that the federal government should not interfere in the states' choices among competing sources of taxation. It was on this ground that some members of the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations based their dissent to the Commission's conclusions. This objection, however, may be merely a matter of presentation. If

the Commission's proposal is stripped of the paeon to the income tax and, instead, presented simply on the ground of permitting states to choose freely among alternative tax sources, it should be more saleable as a political matter.

In contrast, the Heller-Pechman plan constitutes a far more extensive alteration of traditional concepts of taxation. Whether or not it is characterized as a plan with "few strings," under it the federal government would call many of the important shots. The federal attempt to ensure fiscal independence of local governments vis-a-vis the states would almost surely be met with the charge that the federal government—whether through its tax system or otherwise—has no business in thrusting itself to this extent into the states' internal policies. Further, the requirements of audits and compliance with federal laws might be likened to features currently criticized in the categorical grants system. Beyond this, it is difficult to see how the feature of the Heller-Pechman plan providing for redistribution of revenue wealth from high-income-low-population states to low-per-capita-income states could avoid sharp controversy in the Congress. Worth noting, too, is the administrative burden of the Heller-Pechman plan as compared with the income tax credit approach. Any plan in which revenue flows into and out of one pocket before reaching its final destination in another is bound to prove more costly than a similar plan under which revenue is collected directly by its intended final recipient.

Perhaps the safest observation about these two proposals is that the ultimate choice between them depends not merely on straightforward considerations of wise tax policy; rather, the basic political concepts underlying our entire federal system are deeply involved. Before adoption of the credit device, one of the major questions to be answered is whether the states are now prepared to make good and beneficial use of a greater degree of financial independence. In considering the Heller-Pechman proposal, one of the principal hurdles is whether it has any chance at all of proving attractive to Congress.

The federal-state policies of the past—involving, as they have, a limited amount of fiscal independence for the states, with resulting public criticism when that independence has been fettered by federal rules and restrictions—must be closely examined and evaluated. My own view is that—until we give them the means and the freedom to prove themselves—we cannot conclude that there is only a shallow measure of responsibility in state and local governments, or that those governments lack responsibility.

There is no reason to consider the two proposals—federal-state tax sharing and state-local income tax credits—as mutually exclusive, or as involving abandonment of the existing system of financial aid to the states. Nor is there any reason to consider the currently projected mathematics of these proposals to be immutable. Other alternatives exist, too, such as a complete revamping of the categorical grants system. Of course, the possibility exists that a study in depth will lead to the conclusion that all current federal responsibilities should be maintained at the federal level. And then there are the new proposals for supplanting or supplementing government programs through tax incentives to private industry.

In any event, immediate focus on determining the best alternatives is demanded if we are to solve the many domestic problems pressing in on us from all sides. The subject is not one for tax and fiscal experts only, but for all those who are interested in the potential of our federal system. Both political parties, as well as several of our leading newspapers, have begun to treat the question fre-

quently and with growing concern. There is nothing particularly arcane about the desire to strengthen the financial stance of the states with an eye toward propelling them forward. And the hows and whys of the endeavor seem to lie as much in the field of the political scientist and sociologist as in that of the student of taxation.

PORT CHICAGO, A LESSON IN IRONY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, after an expenditure of some \$20 million to acquire the homes of more than 3,000 persons in the town of Port Chicago, Calif., the Navy has informed me that it is cutting back the ammunition outloading operations at the Concord Naval Weapons Station and that more cutbacks are in store.

These operations, Mr. Speaker, are the ones that the Navy cited as the reason for the Port Chicago acquisition, largest condemnation of residential properties in our country's history.

An excellent editorial in the *Pittsburgh, Calif., Post-Dispatch* accurately reflects the feeling of the people in this area and I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

LESSON IN IRONY

The stunning suggestion that Concord's Naval Weapons Station may be cut back sharply or even mothballed is a lesson in irony, one that must arouse keen resentment and bitterness among those forced to sell their homes in Port Chicago.

Indeed, the announcement comes while the little town is in the process of being bulldozed following the Navy's \$20 million purchase to create a so-called "safety" buffer.

While details are sketchy, it now appears the expected withdrawal of troops from Vietnam has eased the war emergency status of shipping from the station. Apparently only the war emergency justified shipping ammunition to all the services through Concord since the Navy says it is cheaper to do so via a similar North Carolina facility.

The big question, of course, is how far the Navy may cut back the Concord station, assuming re-evaluation determines this is necessary. The Contra Costa facility, be it remembered, is the county's largest employer. So there is a worry the Navy may eliminate that payroll in full or in part while retaining its location for some future emergency.

Significantly, the Navy announcement from the capitol said further reductions at the Concord facility might be expected if exports to the Air Force and Army continue to be shifted to the East Coast. At the same time, the station's new commanding officer made the flat statement, "there is no plan whatsoever, no thought of the Navy as far as I know, of trying to move this kind of operation. It's just impractical."

And, he added, "As long as we have a fleet, we're going to have Concord." Further, the captain noted that 11 ships homeported at Concord, would continue to supply the Navy and thus the safety buffer still would be needed.

There is something about all this that is reminiscent of the dogmatic attitude we faced last year when the Navy won its long

fight to buy up Port Chicago. And now, as then, the tone sets the stage for a defense of the land holdings, no matter whether a cutback may be minor, sizable or a mothball job.

We are reminded, of course, that Pittsburgh's Camp Stoneman posed a similar problem, on a far smaller scale. When reductions came, the first local effort was to continue the camp for the understandable, albeit selfish reason, that it represented employment.

A committee flew to Washington in this attempt. When that failed it became clear the Army intended both to close the camp and hold its land which was sizable acreage for a community of this size and located squarely in its geographic heart.

The same committee that had worked to continue the camp then went into action to remove it in entirety, so that the acreage could be freed for development. This was a reasonable goal but it took another trip to Washington and a couple years' work to achieve.

Similarly now, Contra Costa will have to be vigilant to make sure it does not find itself with a mothballed facility and thousands of choice industrial acres left idle, unproductive and off the tax rolls. The military are experienced squatters and we do not expect to see them easily persuaded to let go of any part of the land, no matter how severe the cutback.

It is true, of course, the Navy so far has only proposed to re-evaluate the Concord operation. Cong. Jerome Waldie, however, has claimed the Navy means to mothball it and we have every reason to believe the Congressman speaks from his on-the-scene Washington vantage point.

The possibility, in the wake of the \$20 million spent last year to eliminate Port Chicago, cannot but leave both the evicted residents and Contra Costans angry and disgusted. For there are few in this area, rocked fiercely by that 1944 blast, who are convinced the Navy's "safety" buffer is any "safety" buffer at all.

Too, it remains an ironic footnote to reflect that even as the town is being levelled, the Navy—unless something has changed very recently—continues to operate under the same hazards that all but wiped it out in 1944. This time the means is to a far greater area of the county than 25 years ago.

And now, of course, the final irony is that, after all the arguments and the heartaches and the dollar cost, there is a possibility the station could be mothballed.

Under the circumstances, the Navy should be expected to come up with some good answers. The weapons station was called "temporary" in World War II. Last year it was labelled "permanent" to support the "safety" buffer argument. This year it could be mothballed.

The war situation is responsible for the variation in part. But not entirely. And we, for one, are going to be extremely interested in hearing the Navy's explanation, as well as its justification for hanging on to 12,000 acres of prime land.

DEATH OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN DONALD C. BRUCE

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn last Sunday of the sudden and unexpected passing of our former Indiana colleague, Donald C. Bruce. Don served in the House during the 87th

and 88th Congress. As a member of both the House Education and Labor Committee and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Don Bruce quickly developed a reputation as a Republican who fought hard for principles of sound constitutional government as he understood them. As a former radio and television announcer, Don Bruce was an outstanding speaker and became much sought after by Republicans across the Nation for that reason.

Don Bruce was a man of courage and would not be dissuaded from speaking out on issues when he thought the policy of the U.S. Government was wrong. He was one of the few Members of this body to actively oppose the intervention by the U.S. Government in the Congo. He further challenged the policy of the United States as regards Cuba and was accused by some of being a warmonger, until former President Kennedy announced our blockade of Cuba and the presence of Soviet missiles there.

Above all, however, the safety and well being of the United States came first with Don Bruce. In this respect, he was an ardent foe of Godless communism and all that it stands for. It is with a great deal of sadness that we note the passing of our former colleague and above all a good American. Our hearts go out to his surviving wife, Hope Bruce, and her children in her hour of sorrow.

SOLDIER—STATESMAN—FRIEND

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, with my distinguished colleague from the State of Illinois, and from all sections of our great country, I join you today in special tribute to the memory of our former distinguished colleague, Barratt O'Hara—soldier, statesman, and friend.

Barratt's inspiring and impressive biography has been eloquently placed upon the Record of this House today, and having known him well over a long number of years, I proudly attest to the outstanding qualities manifest in his life which have so impressed all those whose paths crossed his. I would only add my personal salute to his great courage in fighting the just cause of freedom among all peoples of this earth.

It is truly a tribute to our system of government that this outstanding gentleman was repeatedly chosen by his constituents to represent them in the Halls of Congress for so many years, and that Barratt O'Hara met this responsibility in the finest American tradition.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic banner waves more vigorously because it has been borne proudly by men of the caliber of Barratt O'Hara. His children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren can take comfort in the knowledge that Barratt was truly a soldier, statesman, and friend. To the members of his family, I extend deep and sincere sympathy and I share their great loss.

THE CONGRESSIONAL INTERN PROGRAM

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, great is the danger to a nation when her young people seem to no longer have faith in her government. Great is the danger when those to whom the baton of leadership must soon be passed, reject both the baton and those who have run with it this far. The estrangement of many young people in modern America poses just such a danger to this country.

On a daily basis young Americans voice this disenchantment with their Government. Why is it that so many view with such distaste the actions of those elected to govern our country? Certainly, our actions as elected officials are not perfect—much of the criticism leveled at us is, no doubt, legitimate. Yet, why such vociferous opposition and such extensive estrangement?

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that a great deal of this disaffection for our activities here is, in fact, attributable to ignorance and detachment. I mean ignorance in the sense of a lack of information. And as for detachment, I am certain that we all realize that our average age of 52.6 is not conducive to excessive communication with the under-30, "turned-on" generation. Yet, Mr. Speaker, 53 percent of the people whom we represent in this Nation are under 30 years old.

I believe that ours is the soundest and fairest form of government man has developed. I believe that our actions in Washington seldom are reprehensible—and are often even enlightened; for I also recognize the immense complexities of the problems which beset us and the Nation. I also believe, given the facts, the vast majority of young Americans would concur with me.

How, then, I ask, are today's students to meet and come to know what we here face every day? I firmly contend that if more young people could actually participate in their Government—experience government, face the complexities of governing—they would be less estranged, for they would have shared with us the frustrations which we must face.

Since 1965 when the House authorized each Member to employ annually, on a temporary basis, a student congressional intern, each summer the Hill has been alive with active young people. They have not only worked hard and accomplished much for the offices in which they were employed; they have also experienced government. This is why the congressional intern program is so important.

The students who have come here in the summer have seen Congress in action. As they performed their assigned duties they have encountered the same roadblocks and frustrations with which we are confronted. They have worked with complexity—in "the system"—and in addition to problems, they have no

doubt experienced the satisfaction we feel when we can claim a real accomplishment.

So, these students—perhaps 1,000 each summer—benefit from their experience. In most cases they become less estranged; familiarity with our governmental process wears away at the bewilderment and distrust. Understanding, or perhaps wonder that we accomplish what we do, replace estrangement. Best of all, this education does not stop with these 1,000. Rather, they return to their homes and campuses from all over the Nation. Their friends ask about their summers—their jobs, what they saw, what they did, whom they met. The word spreads, it really does.

It is through such positive experiences that our young people will learn and begin to believe. A press release from my office will not convince the students at U. C. Riverside that the establishment in Washington cares about people. By coming to Washington, though, the men and women with whom the future of this country will soon be entrusted will begin to appreciate that they should not drop out—but should climb aboard and in that way change course if they feel it needs to be changed.

A logical conclusion, then, is that we should expand the intern program; get two paid students in each office; get the colleges to send them for a semester as part of a course; have a year-round program. I fully recommend such innovation. The money would be well-invested; for in years to come the dividends would be overwhelming.

However, reality dictates that the time is not ripe for expansion. In the past 2 years, for varied reasons, funds for the congressional summer intern program have been cut from legislative appropriations.

My office has been fortunate in that it has been possible for me to provide sufficient funds from personal resources and by soliciting private donations to hire a summer intern for 3 months each summer. However, there have been from three to six other students working in my office during these months; and they have either received very modest stipends through their colleges' intern programs or else have had sufficient financial resources to assure their own support.

The result of this situation is clear—the majority of students who are here in the summer are from relatively affluent economic backgrounds. Students from poorer families and students who must work in the summer to put themselves through school the following year are deprived of the opportunity of participating, even if they are both eager and capable.

I wish to commend the efforts of my colleague from California, the Honorable JOHN MOSS. Last week an admirable report on the congressional intern program, produced by him and his staff, appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This survey should further convince every Member of the importance of next week's appropriations for this program.

Restoration of the funding provisions of resolution 416 will be testimony to

our belief in the leaders of tomorrow. It is not only for the students who will directly benefit that we should appropriate the funds, however. I believe we must do it for ourselves, and for the survival of our form of government.

AN AGE OF ANARCHY AND REVOLUTION

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Henry Zac Carter, president of Avondale Shipyards, Inc., which appeared in that company's news journal Avondale Salutes.

I have known and have been a close personal friend of Zac Carter for many years. He is one of the most respected individuals in the Greater New Orleans area as well as in the State of Louisiana.

Zac Carter has my utmost respect because he has demonstrated through the years that he is one of those rare persons who is endowed with an intellectual prowess which enables him to grasp and comprehend a current issue or event and bring it into clear focus.

In his article "An Age of Anarchy and Revolution," Zac Carter has expressed his concise view of civil unrest in this country, a view in which I concur completely.

I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

AN AGE OF ANARCHY AND REVOLUTION

(By Henry Zac Carter, president, Avondale Shipyards, Inc.)

We are plunging headlong into an age of anarchy and revolution that can, and must be, stopped if we are to preserve this nation. In a country that, since its inception, has advocated peace, equality and freedom there are elements now at work which must be stopped by whatever legal means necessary. Constituted authority is being challenged by crime on our streets, mob violence, disorderly demonstrations and destruction on our campuses. Where these affect the safety or rights of the American citizen it is the responsibility of our elected or appointed representatives to stop such action and to punish the offenders to the fullest extent of the law.

No man deserves to live in fear. To be harassed or intimidated is beyond the basic concepts of this nation . . . and apathy on the part of any one in authority to protect our citizenry is a violation of our civil rights.

It is time that we also look at the structure and actions of the Supreme Court of this land. In recent years this body has taken it upon itself to be an agency of reform. Its members apparently believe that all of the social problems of America can be settled by judicial decree.

I strongly protest appointments to the bench of this highest court in the land on a lifetime basis or of those having inadequate judicial experience. Men grow old and senility is not unknown to even the highest intellect. Decisions must be handed down but let these decisions be in accord with the best interests of the people rather than upon any abstract findings that could be injurious rather than beneficial.

Apathy and excuses on anyone's part must be discouraged. We speak too often of a

generation gap and of people deprived. Let us be logical. Only 4% of our student population is in revolt . . . let us also consider the other 96% who are attempting to gain an education.

The seizure practices of our student rebels is ominous in that it can overflow into the community. If we excuse the practice of seizure, and do not penalize those who are involved, it is reasonable to assume that the same tactics will soon be adopted by non-student groups. Businesses could be taken over by employees, the military would be vulnerable and customers may take over retail stores. This is socialism and, if allowed, its adoption could mean the end of capitalism in the United States.

Again relating to violence, responsible leaders must be developed among the black community. Too often this group is being used by the politician, dissident elements advocating revolution, and by personally ambitious persons in their own ranks. This element deserves our help but help only if force is not used to achieve a goal.

Violence has never been the American way of life and, if we are to preserve that life, we must eliminate those factors which produce it. Respect and support of an intelligent police force is essential. These people are employed for our protection and, conversely, they are also deserving of our protection. In no instance should the upper hand be given to the criminal or lawbreaker.

In this matter we all have something at stake. This is our country, our children, our neighbors. Too often we detach ourselves from the problems around us. The feeling is that it is happening to someone else, that it is not our problem.

Let me say that any concept that stipulates the overthrow of our country is wrong. We have laws that protect us but, strangely enough, these laws are not being enforced. At such times we must weigh the possibility that we are becoming a nation of politicians rather than statesmen. Laws must be enforced.

Yes, we are on our way to revolution and anarchy but there is still time to eliminate these subversive elements.

SALUTE TO THE EMPLOYEES OF THE MILAN ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

HON. EDWARD JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the employees of the Milan Army Ammunition Plant, Milan, Tenn., most of whom are my constituents and reside in the Eighth Congressional District, have recorded a most enviable safety record of 9,160,000 man-hours without a lost time injury.

This achievement entitles the Milan Army Ammunition Plant and its operating contractor, the Harvey Aluminum Sales, Inc., to claim an industry record for this type plant—shell assembly. This is due to many combined efforts but I would like to especially commend the employees in the plant and their outstanding plant manager, Mr. Frank C. Bryant.

It is my sincere opinion that this record should be recognized as a tribute to the thousands of west Tennesseans who loyally work each day in support of our Nation's servicemen, and I am,

therefore, taking this means of bringing it to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation.

THE NAVAJOS, FAIRCHILD, AND THE GOVERNMENT DEMONSTRATE A FORMULA FOR PROGRESS

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, September 6, I had the pleasure of attending the formal dedication ceremonies of the new Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corp. Semiconductor Plant at Shiprock, N. Mex., on the Navajo Reservation. Under the direction of the Navajo Tribal Council and its progressive chairman, Mr. Raymond Nakai, and with the assistance of a loan from the Economic Development Administration, this modern manufacturing facility was constructed to house the most advanced semiconductor electronic assembly equipment in the world.

The talents of the Navajo people extend beyond imagination. From these peoples come some of the finest craftsmen in the world—silversmiths, artists, and weavers. A Navajo woman weaves a perfectly patterned rug without ever seeing the whole design until the rug is completed. Weaving, like all Navajo arts, is done with unique imagination and craftsmanship, and it has been done that way for centuries.

Building electronic devices, transistors, and integrated circuits, also requires this same personal commitment to perfection. Therefore, it was very natural that when Fairchild Semiconductor needed to expand its operations, its manager looked at an area of highly skilled people living in and around Shiprock, N. Mex., a city of 8,000 people located in northwestern New Mexico on the vast Navajo Reservation.

Since 1965, Fairchild's Shiprock manufacturing and training operation has grown to almost 1,200 men and women, making Fairchild the Nation's largest non-Government employer of American Indians. All but 24 of the 1,200 are Navajo; in fact, of 33 production supervisors, 30 are Navajo.

The success of this operation can be easily measured in terms of growth and expansion. However, the real value of this progress lies in the creation of meaningful jobs for those who have not had jobs—jobs which keep them in the land they love and among the people they know. Most importantly, here is the vivid demonstration of the success of the cooperative efforts of the Federal Government and free enterprise industry working together in the development of individual initiative, achievement, excellence, and a better standard of living for mankind.

There are other similar Government-free enterprise cooperative efforts in successful operation in New Mexico utilizing the talents and skills of the Navajo, the Zuni, the Laguna, and others who have the ambition and will to work to improve themselves. We have the people with the desire to achieve and the space and re-

sources to grow and develop—we invite and welcome others across the Nation to join us in the Land of Enchantment as a neighbor and partner in the progress of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the Farmington Daily Times of September 5, 1969, has presented this successful human development story in an editorial, "A Gamble Which Paid Off," and I include it herewith in the Record for the review of our colleagues:

A GAMBLE WHICH PAID OFF

The new \$1.1 million Fairchild Semiconductor plant which will be dedicated at Shiprock Saturday signifies the industrialization of a sleeping giant.

Staffed almost entirely by Navajos, the plant operates on a 24-hour-a-day basis, manufacturing transistors and integrated circuits that find their ways for use in computers, stereo equipment, communication satellites, and Apollo programs.

The delicate assembly work is ideally suited to Navajo skills developed through their long history of weaving and jewelry making. In addition to assembly jobs, the plant offers machining and tool and die making opportunities and has an extensive plant support services staff. Recently, in an attempt to increase employment opportunities for men, Fairchild initiated a new product assembly area utilizing the skills of a number of Navajo men.

The 34,000-square foot plant represents an imagination and belief in the potential of Indian Americans.

The plant, which operates on a \$6,000 a month lease from the Navajo Tribe, also provides on-the-job training opportunities sponsored by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

What started out as an apprehensive partnership has developed into a mutual admiration society.

Fairchild keeps its assistant personnel director, a Navajo, busy on weekends visiting Navajo chapter houses in the area explaining the plant's mode of operation, its employment requirements, and its general place in the community. Paul Driscoll, plant manager, refers to the employees as "very special people", whose industriousness and desire to learn is unmatched.

On the other hand, the employment has not only enabled the Indians to raise their standard of living, but they have found that age and education have little bearing on their ability to perform this useful work.

The employment record, officials say, also refutes old clichés about the inability of Indians to work at steady jobs.

The fact that Fairchild has gone from 50 to 1,200 employees in less than four years, is an indication of a basically successful and stable operation.

And certainly the plant's annual payroll of \$4.3 million, much of which is spent in San Juan County, has given the area a tremendous economic boost.

If success can be described as finding jobs for those who have not had jobs and jobs which can keep employees in the land they love, among the people and way of life they know best, then Navajo-Fairchild plant is a huge success. The participants are to be commended for their foresightedness and their willingness to gamble on a venture which paid off.

LINCOLN POLICE REPORT

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess, I received a copy of

annual 1968 report of the Lincoln, Nebr., police department. In this report of the activity of Lincoln police during the last year, the various aspects of police-community relationships were illustrated in an educational and interesting manner. In fact, one of the important uses for this bulletin is to assist the police in an extensive educational program for the city youth—a program which helps to explain why Lincoln experienced an increase of less than 1 percent in juvenile contacts last year after 2 successive years where there was an increase of 33 percent each year.

Lincoln is the largest city in the First Congressional District of Nebraska, the district that I represent. I am, therefore, quite concerned over the progress that Nebraska's capital city makes in stemming the growing tide of criminal actions.

It is distressing to note that Lincoln has kept up with the times in compiling a 35-percent increase in major crime during 1968. But on the positive side, the Lincoln police have cleared 30.3 percent of the 2,180 major offenses reported, an outstanding effort when compared to a national clearance rate for major crime of 20 percent.

The annual report outlines the services division and its role in making effective law enforcement. The approximately 3,000 sets of fingerprints taken, the 42,000 meals served to prisoners, and the 50,000 requests for police assistance processed by communication all help to tell the story of hard work behind the story of arrest in the newspaper.

Pictures of a policeman "frisking" a suspect, directing traffic, working his dog, and locating the parents of a lost boy all bring the policeman's work into perspective for school students who see him only as a man in a blue uniform.

Mr. Speaker, it is readily apparent that we can fight the crime of the future by fighting the criminal of the future, and we can do that best by building a relationship of respect and friendship between today's youth and the police. The city police department of Lincoln, Nebr., recognizes this fact and, therefore, it in turn deserves recognition.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 55TH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF OREGON

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from the Second District, AL ULLMAN, and myself, I would like to submit some of the recommendations of the 55th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon to the Members of the House of Representatives for their consideration. The joint memorials, passed in the 1969 session, call for action by this body on issues of importance not merely to Oregon but to the Nation. The draft, water pollution, use of fish, timber, and wildlife resources, industrial development: these all spell

crucial decisions on where this country is going, and how we are going to get there. To have these Oregon Senate proposals heard, I am presenting a summary of their substance:

CHANGING THE DRAFT—SENATE JOINT
MEMORIAL 6

To establish a selective service system based on a lottery in which all eligible persons are subject to the draft for 1 year after they reach 18 years of age. However, they may elect to defer the 1 year during which they will be draftable for a period of 4 years. This measure, designed to assuage present dissatisfaction with draft procedures, would relieve the duration of uncertainty as to jobs, education, and personal decisions.

STAVING OFF POLLUTION—SENATE JOINT
MEMORIAL 11

To authorize money adequate to support the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966. In this way, the Oregon Senate feels, the Congress could show an increased measure of faith in the State and local efforts made under the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966. With such action, a more successful attack may be waged against the pollution of our Nation's waters.

WILDLIFE HABITAT PRESERVATION—SENATE
JOINT MEMORIAL 4

To direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to accelerate programs to rehabilitate or preserve critical wildlife habitat on Federal lands administered by the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management. For accomplishing this, the legislature also asks that the Congress appropriate the necessary funds.

FISHERY DEVELOPMENT—SENATE JOINT
MEMORIAL 5

To provide for adequate funding for full operation of the 21 hatcheries in the Columbia River fishery development program. Natural propagation of salmon and steelhead trout has declined drastically due to construction of more dams and water-usage projects; support for special fishery development is the only hope for preserving these important species.

LET US HAVE SOME DEFERENCE TO
THE TAXPAYER

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time advocate of fiscal responsibility and governmental expenditure cuts, I wish to make a few remarks about what I consider to be questionable policies on the part of the administration.

When we were asked to extend the 10-percent surtax I have grave misgivings over whether it was right and just to vote for extension of an already-burdensome tax when we had no promises from the administration that there would be accompanying or commensurate de-

creases in Federal expenditures. I voted against the extension. A short time thereafter my worst fears were confirmed when a series of proposals were brought forth which I considered to be unwarranted, unnecessary, and extravagant expenditures for Congress to approve. I refer to such things as the John F. Kennedy Cultural Center and increases in overly huge governmental schemes of social experimentation.

My feeling is that there should be a definitely established hierarchy of areas in which cuts can and should be made. For instance, I believe that, before capital expenditure cuts are made in public works, we should cut military waste, social experiment programs—especially those with low cost-benefit ratios—for foreign aid projects, farm subsidies—for nonproduction—and such things as rent subsidies.

I do not make these remarks because I have any pet projects which are threatened by the proposed reduction in Federal construction. Rather, I make them because I think that I am speaking not only for what I consider to be the best interests of my constituents, but for the interests of all American taxpayers as well.

It must be perfectly clear that I am forthrightly and unequivocally in favor of cutting the budget. However, I do believe that it represents poor judgment to talk about increasing foreign aid and welfare outlays while cutting back on the only tangible asset which the taxpayer realizes from the tax dollars he obediently sends to Washington.

The things which the President threatens to cut back on with this recent announcement—highway money, floodwall money, flood retention basins, dams, and reservoirs—are hardly adequate, much less luxurious, and are the only fixed assets which the guy who pays the taxes gets for his money.

New budget requests made since January 1, 1969, for additional authority for foreign assistance governing loans, grants, and credits total \$10,028,000,000. The administration is asking for over a billion dollars more than was appropriated for foreign aid last year.

The newly proposed welfare reform will cost, at the very least, an additional \$4 billion.

I honestly cannot conceive of having to go to my constituents and tell them that the badly needed construction projects in their area have been curtailed while we continue to add to the welfare rolls and ship our wealth overseas. I think that the people of Kentucky and America have the right to demand some consideration. They do not request extravagant outlays for dubious undertakings.

In the Fourth District of Kentucky, right now, there are several badly needed construction proposals—the Southwest Jefferson County Floodwall, the Dayton Floodwall, the Eaglecreek Reservoir, and the Falmouth Dam. These projects are vital and long in coming. It will be difficult for me to tell my constituents that the Federal Government is increasing welfare and foreign aid while they suf-

fer water shortages, disastrous floods, and innumerable other tangible discomforts and inconveniences.

It will be impossible for me to explain to the people of northern Kentucky that, while the traffic congestion tightens its choking grip on them because of the absence of the Circle Freeway and the C. & O. bridge replacement, the Government is exporting \$20.5 million to the Ryukyu Islands and other little heard of corners of the world.

Again, spending cuts are necessary, desirable, and vital to America. But we must approach this problem with a realistic set of priorities. Let us have some deference to the taxpayer.

Let us give him something for his money. Let us let him see some tangible results for the billions that he pays out annually—either in construction or actual services. In light of this, I wish to express my grave misgivings over the President's announced cutback in Federal construction.

I see no other course but to express strong objection and present vigorous opposition to this unrealistic and unjust policy.

TAX-EXEMPT STATUS OF MUNICIPAL BONDS SHOULD REMAIN AS
INCENTIVE TO PROGRESS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the recent Tax Reform Act (H.R. 13270) passed by the House, the bill was considered under a closed rule with no opportunity to offer amendments.

This precluded consideration of amendments on several important provisions, including a provision which related to the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds.

The Nashville Banner in a recent editorial outlines basic objections to any change in the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds, pointing out that the removal of such status would place an unbearable premium on necessary and traditional financing of local improvements and projects.

It is certainly my hope that this provision relating to municipal bonds in the Tax Reform Act will be corrected in the Senate.

The Banner editorial follows:

[The Nashville Banner, Aug. 26, 1969]

IN TAXPAYER INTEREST—TAX EXEMPTION
BELONGS ON STATE, MUNICIPAL BONDS

Metropolitan Nashville, and the State of Tennessee—among the host of those jeopardized by it—are strongly opposed to the Federal measure (HR 13270) which proposes to remove the tax exempt status traditionally granted municipal, state, and county bonds. So, surely, are the other 49 states, and 17,325 city and county governments. If not, they should be.

As discerned by those warning of its consequences, this maneuver, in the name of "tax reform," would put an unbearable premium on this necessary and traditional funding

operation—not only on future bond issues, but those already in existence. It would not militate toward tax relief or equity, but impose the added cost load on every taxpayer, large or small.

The "reform" claimed is illusory. As pointed out by Metro Finance Director Joe E. Torrence, regardless of arguments about "a few wealthy people who get by without paying an income tax because of their holdings of tax-exempt bonds, if this legislation goes through it will create a tremendous tax burden on all local taxpayers." It could cost municipal governments as much as two interest points, and "might make it impossible in some cases to go on the bond market with municipal bonds."

In testifying strongly against the ruinous legislative blow contemplated, Mayor Beverly Briley is speaking for more than Metro Nashville. As president of the National League of Cities, he is spokesman for the hundreds of municipalities represented therein—and his warning is apt. It is a blow both to the fiscal foundations of government at these levels, and to the time-honored concept of mutually-respected sovereignty. Note his reminder:

"The immunity of states and local governments and their agencies from federal taxation in the interest of their legitimate functions is vital for the preservation of our dual-sovereignty system of government. As important as the interest savings may be to local governments, and as important as the revenue loss may be to the federal government because of the tax-exempt character of municipal bonds, these factors are secondary to the preservation of the sovereignty of our states and the integrity of our local governmental system."

It is no secret, certainly, that the Federal Government in recent decades has pre-empted much of the tax field. It was in the state and local government interest—in the light of that—that President Nixon has proposed his revenue-sharing program. The financial benefits of that could be more than wiped out by this maneuver on the part of Congress. Worse, it would load on the whole taxpayer constituency—state by state and community by community—a burden they haven't borne before.

That isn't "reform" in the sense that term has been used by way of long standing promise. It is ASSAULT on every thinning pocketbook.

It is a maneuver of recklessness warranting resistance by every state and local government; and, beyond that, by every member of Congress—in both branches—employed to represent them.

THE RELUCTANCE OF UNCLE SAM'S BUREAUCRATS TO FIGHT POVERTY WITH "THE PILL"

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Sar A. Levitan is one of the Nation's foremost experts on poverty and manpower problems. An article by Dr. Levitan and Mrs. Judith W. LaVor of the George Washington University Center for Manpower Policy Studies is most informative and brings hard facts into an area which has too frequently been dominated by myth; that is, the area of large families, the poor, and birth control. I recommend this article as basic reading; it follows:

THE RELUCTANCE OF UNCLE SAM'S BUREAUCRATS TO FIGHT POVERTY WITH "THE PILL"

(By Sar A. Levitan and Judith W. LaVor)

(NOTE.—Sar A. Levitan is director of The George Washington University Center for Manpower Policy Studies, and Mrs. Judith W. LaVor is a research assistant with the Center.)

The vast majority of the American public favors birth control, and there is general agreement that it is the most effective anti-poverty tool per dollar spent. Nonetheless, federal support of birth control programs is extremely limited and has proceeded haltingly. Whatever progress has been made in this direction must be largely credited to pressures by President Johnson and Congressional willingness to appropriate funds. The blame for the slow progress of birth control programs for the poor must be placed at the feet of federal officials who have circumvented or prevented their expansion. This failure on the part of bureaucracies to adjust to changing conditions is another illustration of the ability of federal agencies not only to disregard public sentiment, but to stymie Presidential prodding and Congressional intent.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF "THE PILL" IN FIGHTING POVERTY

There is a high correlation between family size and the incidence of poverty. Mollie Orshansky, known for her development of poverty statistics, reached the obvious conclusion that "the larger the family, the greater the poverty hazards for children. . . . The poverty rate for all families with 5 or 6 children is three and a half times as high as for families with 1 or 2 children."

Risk of poverty increase with family size

[Percent of families in poverty, 1966]

Number of children:

1-----	9.3
2-----	10.3
3-----	12.8
4-----	18.6
5-----	27.7
6 or more-----	42.1

Even if couples elect to have larger-than-average families, an argument can still be made for promoting birth control because many children born to poor families are unwanted and are frequently a cause of poverty. The misery of many families might have been prevented with an effective birth control service. Despite popular myths, the desire to limit family size is almost universal, cutting across social, geographic, economic and racial lines. Studies indicate that low-income couples want fewer children than those with higher incomes, and nonwhites want no more than whites. The poor are well aware of the connection between excess fertility and poverty, but their aspirations are frequently unrealized.

There were approximately 8.2 million women of childbearing age (15 to 44 years) in 1966 who were poor or near poor. It is estimated that about 5.3 million of these women were fertile and were neither pregnant nor seeking pregnancy. These women would have benefited from birth control services. "Medically indigent" women are frequently unaware of or unable to afford contraceptive devices, and their fertility rate during the first half of this decade was 153 births per thousand compared with 98 per thousand among more affluent women. If the poor and near poor had access to and understanding of contraceptive techniques equal to that of the nonpoor, their fertility rate could have been expected to decline to the same level. Based on these calculations, unwanted births in low-income families could have been reduced by about 450,000 in 1966.

The reduction of birth rates among the

poor would have many positive effects. There would be fewer children born into poor households, and fewer households would be driven into poverty because of unwanted children. This would, of course, reduce the number of the poor, help keep people out of poverty, and arrest the accelerating costs of relief.

A well-known illustration of the effects of such an effort is the family planning program established in 1961 by the Mecklenburg County, North Carolina Departments of Health and Welfare. After four years in operation, the program was cited as an outstandingly successful effort, and there were no reported pregnancies among the more than 1,500 women who participated on a continuing basis. The Aid to Families with Dependent Children caseload for the county had been rising at a rate of about 300 children a year before the inception of the program. After a year of operation the number leveled off, and after six years the number of children receiving AFDC was smaller than it was at the beginning of the program. This occurred despite the rapid population growth of Mecklenburg County. With an approximate patient cost of less than \$25 per year and an annual AFDC cost of more than \$300 per child, the cost effectiveness of the birth control program is obvious.

The cost of providing birth control services to all low-income women is not large in relation to total antipoverty and welfare expenditures, but at the present time less than a fifth of the five million needy women receive these services. Joseph Kershaw, OEO's first antipoverty planner, concluded that "family planning . . . is probably the single most cost-effective antipoverty measure." The projected cost of providing a patient with a medical examination and contraceptive devices is about \$30 annually; a comprehensive program would cost about \$150 million.

Decreased welfare costs are only a part of the total savings that accrue from birth control programs, and AFDC payments are only one of the many direct and indirect costs of poverty. Dollar savings are far from being a major justification for birth control assistance. The primary goal is the reduction of human misery, and many benefits of lower fertility among the poor cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents.

For instance, birth control programs can substantially improve the health of many of the poor. By making physical examinations available to low-income women, the presence of cervical cancer and other diseases can be detected and treated. Family planning can also eliminate the health hazard of frequent pregnancy, draining the mother's energy, causing anemia, and contributing to high maternal death rates. Availability of birth control services, while not a substitute for realistic abortion laws, would also reduce considerably the number of deaths caused by badly performed abortions. No statistics are available, but it is estimated that more than a million women (many of whom are married and already have children) obtain illegal abortions in the United States resulting in thousands of deaths each year.

The health of children can also be substantially improved by birth control. HEW has confirmed that spacing of children reduces the incidence of premature births, physical defects, mental retardation, and infant mortality. An additional benefit of fertility control is that children in smaller families are less likely to be candidates for a life of poverty than children in larger families.

CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARD BIRTH CONTROL

The reluctance of federal officials to fund birth control programs reflects persistent prejudices and a disregard for the facts. Diverse groups have nourished these prejudices. Self-styled spokesmen for relief recipients,

for example, have charged that birth control programs are a plot against mothers on relief. This allegation is just as much a myth as the image of welfare mothers breeding children to increase their monthly checks. In fact, only 14 percent of the five million women needing birth control services are on welfare, and welfare payments hardly provide a minimum standard of living.

Some resistance to birth control services has been voiced by militants who see it as a plot to reduce the black population, but in fact Negroes account for only 30 percent of the potential clientele, and the program is totally volitional. More significantly, the Negro community, especially women with low incomes who would benefit most from the services, have given no support to the militant rhetoric and have staunchly upheld what birth control programs they now have. There is little doubt that the poor would take advantage of accessible birth control services.

Resistance to expanded birth control programs has come from segments of the public other than the poor, but it is diminishing. For at least a decade a majority of American females of childbearing age has approved of birth control, and the consensus has increased rapidly in recent years. In 1965, 85 percent of white and 82 percent of nonwhite women approved of fertility control. The largest increase in approval between 1960 and 1965 was registered among southern Negro women and white Catholic women with a college education. Approval among the former group increased from 60 to 79 percent, and among the latter from 52 to 70 percent. These figures are for unspecified contraceptive methods; the rhythm method alone is almost universally accepted.

This changing public attitude has had its effect on both presidents and Congress in recent years. President Eisenhower considered birth control a private matter unfit for public discussion, much less for federal support. His views later changed and he observed that it is the obligation of the government to consider "the plight of those unborn generations which, because of our unreasonableness to take corrective action in controlling population growth, will be denied any expectations beyond abject poverty and suffering."

Advocates of birth control found a staunch and consistent friend in President Johnson. He felt that poor as well as rich families should "have access to information and services that will allow freedom to choose the number and spacing of their children within the dictates of individual conscience."

Congress has shown its support for expanded birth control programs on several occasions. It earmarked, in the Social Security amendments of 1967, 6 percent of the maternal and child health appropriations of HEW's Children's Bureau for family planning. In addition, it extended Medicaid coverage to birth control services, and required that they be offered to AFDC mothers. In the same year Congress instructed the Office of Economic Opportunity, which had taken a hesitant lead in providing birth control services to the poor, to place greater emphasis on its program. These actions received bipartisan support and marked the demise of major opposition to birth control in the legislative branch.

THE GRUDGING ANTIPOVERTY WARRIORS

Responsibility for the slow implementation and financing of birth control programs rests with two agencies: the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity. These agencies assigned low priority to birth control and failed to allocate adequate resources. HEW provided even more of an obstacle by refusing to acknowledge the need for birth control. Even when Congress specifically earmarked money for this purpose, HEW lagged in

spending it. While OEO did initiate federal birth control programs for the poor, it hardly assumed the leadership that befitted its experimental and advocate position in the war on Poverty. Although OEO responded more actively than HEW to pressures to fund birth control projects, its activities left much to be desired.

By funding a family planning program for Corpus Christi, Texas, in December 1964, OEO became the first agency to take even a timid step into federal involvement in domestic birth control programs. But the agency from its beginning tended to soft-pedal these programs. Some observers claimed that top OEO officials objected to them on religious and moral grounds, and indeed there was a evidence that they feared the reactions of church groups. One was suggested that birth control was not actively supported because instant success could not be claimed. OEO itself has rationalized its timidity on the ground that excessive zeal in this area would open the agency to criticism and place its other programs in jeopardy. This argument is not persuasive in light of the demonstrated effectiveness and the increased public acceptance of birth control. Moreover, OEO did not shrink from funding controversial projects in other areas, but exercised more caution than was justified in supporting birth control projects.

Whatever the reasons for its hesitancy, OEO allocated during its first five years only 0.9 percent of its total Community Action Program funds to family planning projects, showing a caution unsupportable by Congressional and public opinion. In response to Congressional inquiries, Sargent Shriver, OEO's first director, admitted that his agency was receiving more applications than it could fund. But still he refused to recommend that family planning funds be increased or to re-allocate funds from other programs. Nonetheless, OEO could not ignore the mounting Congressional pressures, and funds allocated to birth control projects slowly rose. By the middle of 1969 the number of projects had risen to 168 at a cost of nearly \$13 million, but this amount included funds for research as well as for direct services to the poor. Expenditures are expected to reach \$15 million in fiscal 1970.

OEO's gingerly approach to birth control was reflected not only in the skimpiness of allocated funds, but also in the regulations imposed on grantees. Contrary to the usual OEO policy of trying to secure maximum feasible visibility for its activities, the agency prohibited grantees from using OEO funds to advertise the program, thus forcing project administrators to rely upon local resources to publicize it. This approach was out of character with OEO's usual policy and led one sympathetic columnist to observe that OEO permitted only whispering about its birth control activities. Local contributors often assumed the costs of advertising in the mass media, and this was counted as a part of the local share needed to offset the federal grant. Initially, OEO tried to further restrict the use of family planning funds by prohibiting the issuance of contraceptives to unmarried women. The regulation was rather weakly enforced in most cases; grantees were reportedly encouraged by some OEO officials to circumvent the instructions and juggle book-keeping entries to show that non-federal money was being used to supply materials to unmarried women while federal funds were used only for married women. The unrealistic restriction drew considerable public criticism, and in 1966 the community action agency in the nation's capital rejected an OEO family planning grant because its directors and neighborhood groups viewed the prohibition as objectionable and unenforceable. When Congress stepped in and placed greater emphasis on family planning in 1967, it instructed OEO to leave the requirements and eligibility criteria of family planning

projects to local communities, thus nullifying many of the initial program restrictions.

OEO's community action agencies received all family planning grants with the option of running them or delegating them to other agencies. Planned Parenthood-World Population, with its experience in running programs, was the major delegate agency. More than a fifth of the organization's \$15 million annual budget comes from OEO. Planned Parenthood used OEO funds to open neighborhood family planning clinics in the areas of greatest need.

Reflecting the lack of coordination and enthusiasm at the national level, there was little cooperation among the local agencies involved in birth control. One exception, and a possible model for other communities, was the OEO-funded Los Angeles birth control program in which 10 area agencies banded together to provide a single organized program for the area.

HEW TRIES TO IGNORE SEX

While OEO was being pushed into sponsoring birth control programs, HEW continued to resist, ignoring public concern about birth control as long as possible. The funds earmarked by Congress specifically for it amounted to \$12.5 million in fiscal 1969, and are scheduled to rise to about \$21 million in three years; additional coverage is available under the Medicaid program, and services must be offered to welfare mothers. But HEW has been unable—some charge that it has been unwilling—to effectively utilize these resources and develop a large-scale birth control program. A 1967 report, prepared for HEW by a team of experts headed by Oscar Harkavy of The Ford Foundation and released by HEW Secretary John W. Gardner, documented the agency's recalcitrance in this area. The report pointed out that in the sprawling HEW bureaucracy, less than 10 professionals were assigned full-time to family planning. In December 1967, Secretary Gardner appointed a Deputy Assistant Secretary to coordinate all federal birth control programs. But the effect of this office on the development of birth control programs remains uncertain since it is isolated from program operations and is inadequately staffed, though Secretary Robert Finch has indicated a strong commitment to expand HEW birth control programs.

Until recently any birth control services provided by HEW funds were minute and anonymous; there are no data to support the agency's claim that in 1968 it served one million women. The best guess of knowledgeable public and private officials is that fewer than one million women were being served by all programs. HEW's claim is further tarnished by the fact that it has had no reporting or data-keeping system whatsoever for birth control.

States are now required to submit time-tables for extending state-wide family planning services in their maternal and child health plans. The Social Security amendments require that such services be available to all medically indigent women by 1975. It remains to be seen whether HEW will have the will or the personnel to monitor the plans and provide the necessary assistance to communities attempting to develop programs.

Perhaps the most serious obstacle to an expanded birth control program has been the attempt of Children's Bureau physicians to use family planning funds to provide the equivalent of comprehensive maternal and child health care. The physicians responsible for program content urge, if not insist, that family planning projects include social and counseling services, nutrition experts, various types of nurses, and nearly every type of medical and paramedical personnel. Given this orientation, one wonders how much emphasis will be placed on actually providing needed birth control services, and indeed how much of the funds earmarked by Congress

will actually be spent on them. The broader type of family planning advocated by HEW officials is undoubtedly beneficial to those receiving it, but the focus of the already meager birth control funds should be on wider distribution of "the pill."

In addition to HEW's Children's Bureau, the Public Health Service is responsible for getting birth control services to American Indians and Alaskan natives. Its performance for these special groups has been no better than the efforts of the Children's Bureau. It is apparent that HEW finds it difficult to operate service programs that place it in direct contact with potential public controversy; however, the agency is able to perform on a sizable scale and without qualms in the more abstracted area of research. The National Institutes of Health's Center for Population Research studies all aspects of contraception and has made grants to universities and other private research groups to find safer, more convenient ways to control fertility. With an annual budget of \$6.5 million, the Center has also performed research, filling gaps that the drug industry left unattended lest new products reduce profits. The willingness of NIH to subsidize birth control research has not been manifested by the Children's Bureau, the Public Health Service, and OEO in the area of direct birth control services for the poor.

DELIVERY OF SERVICES

Birth control programs must, to be effective, be implemented in neighborhoods where the need exists. Contraceptive services are often provided to postnatal patients in hospitals and to women in pediatric clinics and health departments; it now remains to make delivery of these services to the poor a major program. There is evidence that the response to easily accessible neighborhood family planning clinics is greater than to centralized clinics offering a variety of psychological, social, and counseling services. OEO's community action agencies often provide family planning in neighborhood multi-service centers or set up small decentralized clinics specifically for birth control information and service. While this kind of setup is workable in well-populated areas, rural areas and small towns pose a problem. Service to these areas could be achieved relatively inexpensively by equipping mobile vans, staffing them with minimal personnel (a physician plus a nurse or trained subprofessional), and sending them out to the countryside. The vans could be utilized in urban areas as well.

The accessibility of facilities does not guarantee use unless the poor are reached and advised about the availability and content of services. The OEO programs use subprofessional residents of the areas to be served for this function. Popular outreach methods include door-to-door informational campaigns, group meetings, and in some cases even the utilization of male workers to inform and encourage support from the local men. Ancillary services such as transportation and babysitting are often provided to make it easier for women to attend the clinics.

A birth control clinic can be established nearly anywhere as long as there are separate rooms for reception, examination, and nurse consultations. The cost of equipment is not great and the bulk of the funds is spent on personnel. The services of a physician and a nurse are required; subprofessionals perform other tasks such as education, interviewing, outreach, and maintenance. With these facilities adequate services and health precautions can be provided; any more would be of peripheral value, and some irrelevant.

One problem that is inevitable in relation to any expansion of health services is the critical shortage of physicians. Perhaps eventually certain professional standards will have to be modified to allow registered nurses or medical interns to perform the necessary simple examinations and to prescribe contraceptive devices. While this would

most likely arouse charges of "cheating the poor," services by credentialed professionals are not necessarily synonymous with high quality medical care. There is little evidence that years of medical and postmedical schooling are needed to provide birth control assistance. Adequate training programs should be established for all professional and subprofessional personnel involved in the delivery of birth control services.

WHAT WILL THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION DO?

Federal officials charged with the responsibility of funding birth control efforts managed to ignore Congressional mandates and repeated urgings by President Johnson. Foot-dragging, if not outright sabotage, characterizes the activities of many federal health officials who should be concerned with family planning. As a result, birth control programs currently serve less than a fifth of the potential clientele. If birth control programs for the poor are to be expanded, pressure from Congress must continue, backed by adequate appropriations, and the President must provide leadership both inside and outside the government to insure that birth control services will be available to all.

The early months of the Nixon administration do not justify optimism that the federal government will provide the active leadership and resources needed for effective birth control. The new administration has shown an inclination to avoid controversial welfare issues and to expand programs in aid of the poor only in response to pressures generated in connection with specific issues.

While the President finally broke his silence on the issue in mid-1969 with a population message to Congress, he has yet to make clear his specific intentions. Nixon called for increased contraceptive research, personnel training, and challenge the lack of federal coordination and commitment to birth control services to all who need them, but his only concrete action was to recommend a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future to "study" the problems of population. The commission is a tried and true method of avoiding action and "coordination" is no substitute for an increased commitment of resources. One wonders if birth control will receive the promised and needed priority.

Public and Congressional pressures will still be needed to prod the President into assuming a more active role in the expansion of federal birth control programs. It is hoped that President Nixon will consider the present demands and expand services to all those who need them, instead of establishing commissions to delay facing the problems.

TRAGIC DEATH OF A CHAMPION— ROCKY MARCIANO DIES IN PLANE CRASH

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Rocky Marciano who died tragically in a plane crash on August 31, 1969—the eve of his 46th birthday. All over the world, from Paris, to Rome, to America, his death is mourned by all who knew of his legendary career in the world of boxing.

Rocky, who was world heavyweight boxing champion, retired undefeated after winning 49 fights—43 of them by knockouts. He won the world heavyweight title in 1952 by a 13-round knock-

out of Jersey Joe Walcott, and successfully defended his crown six times before his retirement. He was elected to boxing's Hall of Fame in 1959.

The world has suffered the loss not only of a great fighter but a great man—for Rocky possessed a dauntless courage, boundless humility, and a heart full of kindness and love for his fellow man. It was these qualities that endeared him not only to his friends, but to those he defeated in the ring.

Rocky Marciano earned the genuine admiration and deep respect of all who knew him, and his career was an inspiration to our youth. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him as a friend for so many years deeply mourn his passing, and our hearts go out to his bereaved family.

Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending our deepest sympathies to his wife, Mrs. Barbara Marciano, to his daughter, Mary Ann, and to his son, Rocky Kevin, on their great loss.

In the Washington Post on September 2 an article appeared on the life and accomplishments of Rocky Marciano. It accurately portrays the life of an outstanding champion who possessed great strength and integrity. The article follows at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FORMER HEAVYWEIGHT CHAMP DIES AS PLANE FALLS IN IOWA

Rocky Marciano, the only heavyweight boxing champion to retire undefeated, was killed on the eve of his 46th birthday.

He died with pilot Glenn Belz, 37, and Frank Farrell, 23, both of Des Moines, Iowa, in the crash of a single-engine Cessna plane Sunday night on a farm near Newton, Iowa.

The plane struck a tree. Mr. Marciano's body was pinned beneath the main wreckage and a piece of debris pierced his skull. All three men were killed instantly, according to the county medical examiner.

They were en route to Des Moines from Chicago for a party at a steakhouse to celebrate Mr. Marciano's birthday. A flight service official said Belz notified him about 10 p.m. EDT that he was going to land at the Newton airport and gave no indication that he was in trouble.

RETIRED IN 1956

The crash apparently occurred a short time later. Mr. Marciano had planned to fly to his home in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., yesterday for a birthday party with his wife, Barbara; his daughter, Mary Ann, 16, and his 17-month-old son, Rocky Kevin.

Mr. Marciano announced his retirement on April 27, 1956, after winning all 49 of his professional bouts, 43 by knockouts. His last bout was against Archie Moore, former light-heavyweight champion, on Sept. 21, 1955. He knocked out Moore in the ninth round in his sixth title defense.

CONSIDERED COMEBACK

Mr. Marciano was knocked down only twice, by Moore and by Jersey Joe Walcott, from whom Marciano won the title with a 13th-round knockout on Sept. 23, 1952 at Philadelphia.

His fight with Walcott was regarded as the best heavyweight bout since Jack Dempsey knocked out Luis Firpo of Argentina in the second round in 1923.

Mr. Marciano revealed in 1966 that he considered making a comeback in 1959, after Ingemar Johansson of Sweden won the title from Floyd Patterson, but abandoned the idea after several sessions of training in private convinced him that he could not get into proper condition.

Although he weighed 13½ pounds at birth in Brockton, Mass., the oldest of six children born to Italian immigrants, he was the second shortest and second lightest heavyweight champion at 5-foot-11 and 185 pounds. Bob Fitzsimmons was a half-inch shorter and weighed 162. Marciano did have the shortest reach, 68 inches.

WORE DOWN OPPONENTS

But he was blessed with stamina, trained almost constantly and wore down many of his opponents with his clubby arms and powerful fists.

He was 23 years old when he fought his first professional bout knocking out Lee Epperson in Holyoke, Mass., in the third round. Mr. Marciano won his first 16 bouts by knockouts, nine of them in the first round.

He fought in Washington during that streak, stopping Gil Cardone in the first round on Sept. 30, 1948.

FIGHTS GROSSED \$4 MILLION

Mr. Marciano's fights grossed \$4,003,580. His purses, before taxes and his manager's cut, for seven championship bouts totaled \$1,460,338.

He knocked out former champion Joe Louis on Oct. 26, 1951, in a nontitle bout and Louis retired after that, except for exhibition bouts.

Besides Louis and Moore, Mr. Marciano twice defeated Ezzard Charles, another former champion, once by decision and later on an eight-round knockout. Both victories came in title bouts in New York.

He was elected to Boxing's Hall of Fame in 1959.

In 1946, a year before he began his boxing career, Mr. Marciano was given a tryout as a catcher by the Chicago Cubs' baseball club, but although he hit well he did not throw well enough.

The son of a shoemaker in a city known for that industry, Mr. Marciano quit school at 14 to augment the family income and worked at digging up streets, dishwashing, candy making and truck driving before he turned to boxing.

Al Weill, who had managed other boxing champions perceived potential in Mr. Marciano's strength despite his awkwardness and promptly put him to work under Charlie Goldman, a trainer of note.

WEILL CHANGED HIS NAME

At birth Mr. Marciano was Rocco Francis Marchegiano and it was Weill who changed his name. A friend of his father, Peter, sent the parent a pair of boxing gloves with a card on which was printed, "Hall to the Champ."

There was no hint that the prophecy would be fulfilled until he served with the Army in Wales in World War II and was urged by friends to cut down to size a bully in the camp. He was selected because he was so rough in football and baseball games.

He had not boxed previously but he knocked out the bully in two rounds. When Mr. Marciano returned to the United States he began sparring at Ft. Lewis, Wash. After his discharge he boxed as an amateur and later persuaded Weill to handle him.

He used to thumb his way from Brockton, Mass., to New York City, to save money.

Although Mr. Marciano was frugal, he lost money in several investments after he retired from boxing. But he was believed to have retained the bulk of his ring earnings and associated income, which was estimated to total about \$1.7 million.

DEATH MOURNED IN EUROPE

Boxing, being an international sport, Mr. Marciano's death was big news in Paris, Rome and elsewhere in Europe. In Ripa Teatina, Italy, where his parents were born, many of the 3,000 inhabitants gathered in the town square to mull over the news. Condolences were offered to a cousin.

In Chicago former champion Cassius Clay/CXV—1557—Part 18

Muhammad Ali said, "He was so great and so popular and yet he never showed conceit. I got to know him when we were filming a computer fight not long ago, but Rocky will never get to know how it comes out. For a guy his age he was in just as good a shape as me (27). For a week after that I couldn't lift my arms because the body punches were for real."

"SADDEST NEWS" FOR LOUIS

Who would have won a real fight between them? Clay was asked.

"Marciano would never say that he could beat me," Clay said, "and I won't say I could beat him. It would have been a real fight."

In Charlotte, N.C., Joe Louis said, "This is the saddest news I have ever heard. When he defeated me I think it hurt him more than it did me. He sent a message to my dressing room saying he was sorry. He just had a good heart."

Mr. Marciano's body was taken to Brockton for a requiem mass at 10 a.m. Thursday. It will then be taken to Fort Lauderdale, for another. Burial there is set for Saturday.

GEORGE L. GOLDMAN, BENEFACTOR

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, I and thousands of other Kansas Citians lost a dear friend. There are few men of whose death such a statement can be honestly made. But the more than a thousand people who attended George L. Goldman's funeral prove the accuracy of that statement.

The Kansas City Star editorial which follows tells of George Goldman's remarkable life and contributions to his fellow men:

GEORGE L. GOLDMAN, BENEFACTOR

In describing the remarkable George L. Goldman and his never-ending good deeds, a friend once spoke of him as a lamplighter who in his walk through life "made life brighter and more secure for many others." It was a modest but accurate way of summing up this native Kansas Citian who died yesterday at the age of 80. He was an outstanding civic leader, business executive, philanthropist, fund raiser extraordinary, benefactor of youth organizations and athletic programs and even a one-man ecumenical movement.

There was another side of George Goldman that was most prominent in his earlier years. Along with being a star basketball player who eventually was named to the Missouri Sports Hall of Fame, Mr. Goldman was an excellent singer. His fondness for show business led him into the production of minstrel shows in the 1920s and 1930s. He once estimated that he had staged more than 100 of these events, all for benefits of one kind or another.

It was in this same period that he served as an alderman and councilman. As president pro tem of the city council, he functioned as acting mayor. In that capacity the tall, distinguished-looking Mr. Goldman welcomed Queen Marie of Romania and Charles A. Lindbergh to Kansas City. Lindbergh came here to dedicate the Municipal Air Terminal in 1927. The farsighted George Goldman had envisioned the potential of aviation for this community and had worked to establish the convenient airport site.

Although Mr. Goldman was not a seeker

of recognition, he was honored publicly many times. He was proudest, perhaps of a Benemerenti medal bestowed on him by Pope Pius XII for distinguished service to the church. Mr. Goldman, of the Jewish faith himself, had been president of the Catholic Youth Organization. With his brother and jewelry firm partner, Fred Goldman, he had built an athletic field that later became the C.Y.O. stadium. Mr. Goldman was as generous in assisting Protestant churches and their activities as he was in supporting Jewish and Catholic undertakings. His foremost purpose was for the people to work together regardless of creed or race.

When he was invited to meet with other civic leaders in the interest of a new enterprise or one that was in difficulty, there was a tendency to "let George do it." George Goldman, ever gracious and gentle, invariably responded. His interest in helping Indians near Grand lake in Oklahoma, a favorite fishing place of his, led to his being named a member of the Cherokee nation. An appropriate Indian name for him would have been "Chief Great Heart." For George Goldman, the bachelor who did so much for this community's young people, was a grand human being as well as one of our finest citizens.

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article which dramatically points out the need for intensive management of our national forests appeared recently in the Oregonian, a highly respected and authoritative newspaper in the Nation's No. 1 timber State. Written by Mr. Herbert Lundy, editor of the Oregonian, the article describes the devastating losses of timber caused by fir bark beetles, and warns that further losses can be expected unless Congress is convinced that "intensive forest management is good business for everyone." That means commercial timber operators, outdoor conservationists, the U.S. Forest Service, and most importantly the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, such intensive modern management of our national forests is the purpose of the proposed National Forest Timber Supply Act which I have introduced along with more than 60 colleagues in the House. The need for this legislation arose from our concerns in meeting the housing needs of our country both in the next decade and the years beyond. The Forests Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, has held extensive hearings on this legislation which has been substantially revised to meet certain concerns raised by conservation groups about the effect on multiple use. My subcommittee will meet next week to consider this legislation in executive session and hopefully we will have this much needed program ready for your consideration in the near future. I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Lundy's most perceptive comments which I would like to submit for the RECORD.

The article follows:

FIR BARK BEETLES MAKE CASE FOR INTENSIVE FOREST CARE

The House Appropriations Committee has just added \$6.9 million to the U.S. Forest Service budget in recognition of industry demands for intensified management programs. It isn't a drop in the bucket of need. In fact, the federal government is many years behind in its politically-hamstrung management of its multi-billion-dollar timber resource.

The rangers and supervisors of the Forest Service know what needs to be done but they don't have the money and manpower to do it. Let's have a look at a recently visited section of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest across the Columbia River in Washington.

There is a resurgence of the Douglas fir bark beetle in the Wind River district, particularly along the ridges girding the Little White Salmon River. This "bug" is always present in forests. It seems to get out of hand after a couple of dry summers followed by blowdowns and snowbreaks. The flying beetles multiply in green down timber and attack standing timber as well, particularly healthy second-growth. The beetles penetrate the bark and lay their eggs. The grubs bore around the tree and girdle it and the tree dies.

About 120 million board feet of standing timber in the Wind River district—2.4 per cent of the inventory—are infested by the bark beetle. The only way to stop the spread and save the infested timber and the adjacent forest is to log it out of there pronto. This infested timber is worth about \$12 million. But even by selling more than the allowable cut—borrowing some from other districts—the rangers can't get it all out in time.

And this 120 million board feet, covering about 2,000 acres in scattered patches, are only a part of it. The Douglas fir bark beetle is also on the warpath this summer in the Mt. Baker, Mr. Hood, Umpqua, Rogue River and Siskiyou national forests. The total of the infested timber is around one billion board feet.

The beetles are raising hob with multiple use management programs. Normally, timber sales would be plotted to log out old growth fir while second-growth is maturing. Clear-cuts would be carefully plotted with concern for scenic values, water supplies and nature of the terrain. In the Wind River district, under beetle pressure, large areas scheduled for partial logging have to be clear-cut, and old growth timber is being left so that infested immature timber can be removed.

Some outdoor lovers who scream "desecration" at the sight of large clear-cuts on hillsides visible from stream or recreation road might stop to consider that foresters don't always have a choice in the matter.

So what has this to do with long-range management? The bark beetle, which is immune to sprays and other controls, would not reach epidemic proportions if forests could be managed acre by acre. Thinning would give the remaining firs the vigor to resist the beetles by "pitching out."

But to ever attain that foresters' Valhalla, complete management, would require a vast road system placing every tree within reach of tractor or high line. Most of these roads would be rough, ungraveled access tracks, but they must lead to more substantial truckroads. Timber buyers can't afford to build all these roads if they are permitted to take out only a few of the trees in a plot. And the Forest Service doesn't have the money to do it.

All these factors lead to emergency clear-cutting in areas which shouldn't be clear-cut, with consequent disturbance of other forest values and economic loss in timber.

Will there ever be a time when the very able and dedicated foresters can manage their domains on an acre-by-acre basis for the highest values?

Perhaps. But not in decades unless commercial interests and outdoor conservationists quit fighting each other and the Forest Service and convince Congress that intensive forest management is good business for everyone.

THE COURTESIES OF THE FBI

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Select Committee on Crime I have been participating in a series of most informative and, I think, important hearings on the problem of crime in this Nation.

With the sole exception of one Federal agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, our committee has had the excellent cooperation of public and private agencies and individuals representing these agencies.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation informed our committee that it was not his or the Bureau's policy to appear before open session hearings. I found this policy to be unfortunate indeed, and, in fact, a hindrance to the operations of this committee. I publicly stated my opinion of this policy and it was given widespread exposure.

Among the comments on this issue were those expressed in an editorial in the Antioch Ledger in my district.

I would at this time like to insert this editorial in the RECORD:

FBI CHIEF OFFERS CONTRADICTION

"Arrogance and condescension have no place in law enforcement.

"Departments seeking means to improve their public image should check their courtesy ratings.

"Courtesy is basic to good public relations.

"While it may be in danger of becoming a lost art in some segments of our complex society, courtesy must be an ingrained habit of every law enforcement officer.

"He should always have 'time for courtesy.'"

The foregoing quote, the words of J. Edgar Hoover, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, were printed in the Aug. 1, 1969, FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

We must question the meaning of those words in the light of what happened late last week.

Hoover not only refused to testify before the Crime Committee of the House of Representatives, but also refused to permit any of his subordinates to testify.

Our own Congressman, Jerome Waldie, is a member of that committee, and he was justifiably miffed at this snub from the number one man in law enforcement in this country.

How, asked Congressman Waldie, could his committee do its job "without the cooperation of the top law enforcement agency in the federal government?"

"This also concerns me," said Waldie, "because I think any executive agency has a responsibility to assist a congressional committee."

We join Congressman Waldie in asking why a department so concerned with its "public image" and "public relations" would refuse to answer questions posed by representatives elected by the public?

This is the type of action that breeds the arrogance which Hoover preaches against.

We believe that the FBI has little to hide, but this cavalier attitude toward a duly authorized body makes us wonder.

Waldie, for instance, said he wanted to ask how much of the FBI budget goes to fighting internal subversion and how much goes to battling crime.

He wanted to ask why was a new office created in the Justice Department to over-see the federal anti-narcotics effort instead of using the FBI.

These don't seem to be unreasonable questions to us.

We hope Hoover re-considers his position.

For as he says himself, "The good will and assistance of the public are his (the police officers) most valuable assets."

We might add the same from Congress is rather vital to the FBI.

OUR OVERALL NAVAL STRENGTH

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been voiced in recent months regarding the relative strength of the United States and the Soviet Union in the matter of naval strength. It is a matter of considerable concern that while we are in the process of reducing our naval forces, Russia apparently is increasing its overall strength. It is, of course, true that our overall naval strength is still greater than that of the Soviet Union but serious questions are now being raised as to the dangers to which we might be submitting ourselves by any unilateral reduction which we might make regardless of the circumstances.

I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a very fine editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, August 27 edition of the Richmond News Leader, Richmond, Va. The editor has raised some very vital questions and included in his editorial some pertinent information.

I, therefore, wish to include with my remarks the editorial entitled "We're Losing" and commend this to the reading of Members of the House. The editorial is as follows:

WE'RE LOSING

If the United States Navy were to lose ten percent of its ships and personnel in battle and if the enemy were then recognized as the world's dominant sea power, the American people would be stunned. Yet last week's announcement of such an impending loss stirred hardly a ripple on our somnolent summer scene. The Navy, we learn, is to be decimated as a result of a \$3 billion Defense Department budget cut imposed by Congress; the fleet will shortly be reduced from 900 to 800 ships on active duty and Navy personnel will be axed by 72,000 men, down to 700,000. In the confusion of our time, many befuddled liberals now regard the so-called military-industrial complex, once hailed as the arsenal and guardian of free men everywhere, as a greater menace than the Communists.

This Naval disaster dramatizes and confirms a revolution in world seapower wherein the United States has drifted from unchallenged supremacy to second place behind the Soviet Union.

During the past eight years, our govern-

ment has concentrated its attention and resources on the war in Vietnam—a war that it refuses to win and that the Communists find profitable to continue. While we have thus been bogged down, the Russians have raced ahead for the big payoff in naval and nuclear superiority.

Already the United States and its NATO allies are being challenged by Russian naval might in the Mediterranean. With more than 60 ships there, Soviet strength is greater than the United States Sixth Fleet. Meanwhile, Communist influence and Russian naval support bases have been extended from Syria and Egypt in the Middle East all across North Africa to Algeria, in a vast pincer designed to strangle Western Europe.

RUSSIANS HOLD

Admiral H. G. Rickover, the father of our nuclear submarine fleet, recently warned that the Soviets now have by far the largest submarine force in the world—about 375 submarines, all built since World War II. We have 143, including 61 diesel submarines, most of which are of World War II vintage. Thus the Russians now have a net advantage of about 230 submarines and will launch 28 new undersea units this year. By comparison, the United States will launch only one or two new subs. Admiral Rickover estimates that by the end of 1970, the Soviet Union will gain a numerical lead over the United States in nuclear submarines. *Next year!*

Russian superiority is not confined to submarines. The Soviets have armed their destroyers and other surface vessels with surface-to-surface atomic missiles having a range of 100 miles or more. We have no surface vessels carrying atomic missiles.

Admiral Rickover goes on:

"In the single year of 1968, the Soviets put to sea a new type ballistic missile nuclear powered submarine as well as several new types of nuclear attack submarines—a feat far exceeding anything we have ever done. It is estimated that by 1974 they will have added about 70 nuclear-powered submarines to their fleet, whereas we will add but 26—thus further increasing their superiority."

UNITED STATES MORE VULNERABLE

The submarine has become the blue-chip weapon of the atomic age. Its mission is no longer restricted to sinking surface ships. The Polaris-type submarine, with its long-range, nuclear-tipped missiles, brings the principal cities and military installations of the enemy homeland into its crosshairs. Clearly, in warfare's new dimension, geography has made the United States much more vulnerable than the Soviet Union, largely shielded from the open seas by other nations; the American people are concentrated in major cities along the Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific coasts—now all but defenseless against instant destruction from submarine-launched hydrogen bombs.

Apparently very little thought has been given the fact that the wide oceans, which once isolated us from foreign foes, have become broad avenues of peril. Small wonder that our Central Intelligence Agency is so concerned about Kremlin plans to have fleets of missile submarines prowling permanently all along U.S. coasts—enemy units always on the move, units that cannot be tracked by radar or by sight. Small wonder the Pentagon is concerned that the Russians are expanding their Cuban naval installations in order to provision their missile submarines stationed off our shores.

LOOKING DOWN A GUN

We shall soon be looking down a Communist gun barrel. The 15-20 minute warning period that the Pentagon once counted on with any missile fired from the Soviet Union will be so greatly reduced by the presence of nearby enemy submarines that no re-

sponse may be possible before all our retaliatory missiles and our cities are destroyed in a surprise sub-based missile attack. In such eventuality, only our own missile submarines could respond. But the Soviets may gamble that their extensive antiballistic missile (ABM) defenses would neutralize this potential punishment. Our military leaders, who have recognized this unthinkable threat, have spoken only in guarded terms for fear of panicking the public.

Instead of reducing the Navy, the Nixon Administration and the Congress should forthwith embark on a crash program to construct not fewer than 75 nuclear submarines equipped with Poseidon missiles. We should also concentrate on developing more effective anti-submarine warfare techniques. For, if this is to be the arena where Russia plans to win World War III, we dare not be unprepared.

The stakes could not be higher. The Soviet Union is bidding for nothing less than world control through either blackmail, subversion or military conquest. Our own goal is more modest: It is simply national survival.

BIDS FAREWELL TO "CHUCK" JOELSON

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in bidding a fond farewell to my good friend "Chuck" JOELSON. Since he joined our ranks in 1961, this House and the Nation have benefited immeasurably from his vision, creativeness, and his tenacity in pursuing legislative goals he knew to be in the best interests of our citizens.

His thorough training as a lawyer, followed by a distinguished career as a public servant in New Jersey municipal and State councils, fitted him admirably for the outstanding job he has done in his all too brief service in the House. While we shall miss his wise counsel, the judicial bench of New Jersey will become enriched by acquiring it.

None of us can ever forget his brilliant leadership in the recent successful effort to increase the appropriations for educational programs. With these additional funds, it is not beyond possibility that an even greater number of our youth can now prepare themselves to become the well-informed, active, useful citizens of "CHUCK" JOELSON's stamp that America needs if it is to continue to grow and prosper.

And aside from his official duties, "CHUCK" was the ideal gentleman with whom to be in contact during our day-to-day pursuits. He is possessed of a charming wit and sense of humor, conscious at all times of the amenities, giving of his wide knowledge freely, without pretense or ostentation.

During an average number of terms served in the House, by an average number of Representatives, who come in contact with a very large number of colleagues, past, present, and in the future, all who have so served will remember "CHUCK" JOELSON as much more than an average man.

GI BILL FOR QUINCY'S 126TH

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1968, the 126th Supply and Service Company—the National Guard unit at Quincy, Ill.—was activated, and in mid-September they departed to begin their service. In many cases, a tremendous personal sacrifice was made by these men, who were compelled to leave families, jobs, and education behind. Yet, willingly, they went because their country had called them. Most went to Vietnam. Duc Tho, Long Binh, Da Nang—they lived in the places that made tragic news here in the United States. Some received special awards for outstanding performance—all served with distinction. Now, over 1 year after they were activated, the men of the 126th have returned home.

Unfortunately, these men will not qualify under the GI bill for the same educational benefits as members of the Regular Armed Forces. For Regulars, all time including time spent in basic training is counted for purposes of educational benefits. For reservists and guardsmen the period of active duty for training prior to the activation of the unit does not count.

Whatever can have been the original basis for such a distinction, there is no justification for it today. The men of the 126th served their country with pride. The courage and conviction, determination and devotion that they displayed under great handicaps—psychological as well as physical—in a strange and distant war put them among the front ranks of all of our military men. They should be accorded the same treatment, the same benefits, as those of the Regular Army at whose side they stood in Vietnam.

To correct the inequity in the present law, I am today introducing a bill which provides that reservists and guardsmen who are called to active duty and serve at least 6 months during the period of the war in Vietnam, may include their prior active duty for training in determining eligibility for educational benefits under the GI bill. This is the very least that we can do for those who have given so much for their country.

Text of bill follows:

H.R. 13644

A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted as active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) (3) of section 1652 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and section 1661(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of this subsection and subsection (a) of section 1661 (except as provided in the last sentence thereof)".

Section 2 Subsection (a) of section 1661 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this chapter and subject to the limitation in subsection (c), if a veteran serves for a period

of active duty pursuant to a call or order thereto issued to him after August 4, 1964, as a Reserve or a member of the National Guard or Air National Guard or any State, and is an eligible veteran as a result of such duty, any period of not more than 6 consecutive months of full-time duty performed by him after January 31, 1955, for the purpose of obtaining initial military training pursuant to his Reserve, National Guard, or Air National Guard obligation shall be deemed to be active duty."

A LOOK AT DDT

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, both the scientific and government communities have recently been voicing their concern about the use of DDT and the effects of the chemical on our natural environment. How dangerous is the chemical, and is its continued use necessary?

Dr. G. K. Kohn, a noted scholar in the area of agricultural chemicals, attempts to answer these questions in a statement he delivered recently at the Thorne Ecological Foundation's Seminar on Environmental Arts and Sciences, held at Aspen, Colo.

Dr. Kohn shows what the discovery and use of DDT has meant to the improvement of world health and agriculture, but he also scrutinizes the hazards of the continued use of the chemical.

He urges further research into the effects of DDT; he suggests that safer pesticides be substituted for DDT where and whenever possible; and he advises that the Government consider regulations that would protect the Nation's total environment.

Both supporters and opponents of the continued use of DDT will find Dr. Kohn's article informative and helpful. His views are not necessarily those of any group on this issue. And it is because of Dr. Kohn's independence that I find his statement so interesting.

Dr. Kohn, who has written several articles dealing with agricultural chemicals, is well known among his colleagues as an authority in the area.

He served as chairman of the Symposium on Decontamination of the Environment at the 1968 meeting of the National American Chemical Society, and he is also a member of the executive committee of the pesticide section of the Agricultural and Food Division of the A.C.S.

I include Dr. Kohn's article on DDT in the RECORD at this point:

VALUES IN CONFLICT: A LOOK AT DDT AND THE CHLORINATED HYDROCARBONS*

(By G. K. Kohn)

INTRODUCTION

It is not my purpose to debate nor to proselytize nor to sell. I will however, try to provide some facts and to point out some distinctions between what is meant in

the world of science as "hard" fact or data, and logical conclusions therefrom and for want of a better term, "soft" data and the speculations derived from such data. Whereas all other sciences tend to isolate and particularize, ecology by definition, is concerned with universals, with the interrelationships of life and environment in their totality. My remarks then do not reflect the approach of industry, of pesticide manufacture, even of any particular science. I hope they transcend these and include; value systems, science, ethics and citizenship, at least this is the spirit with which I intend them.

In outline then, I will try to cover:

I. The History of DDT and Its Development.

II. Some Significant Physical, Chemical and Biological Properties of DDT.

III. What DDT Has Accomplished In: (a) Agriculture; (b) Public Health.

IV. Undesirable Consequences From DDT, True and Questionable.

V. A Holistic Approach to the Use of DDT and The Chlorinated Hydrocarbons.

Like many others, I participated in the early experiments with chlorinated hydrocarbons. As a GI in the hold of an army transport, a new flea and louse powder was provided all of us with which we dusted ourselves, our bedding and clothing and with which we probably avoided typhus and greater and lesser scourges and started our personal accumulation of chlorinated hydrocarbons in our body fat.

HISTORY AND PROPERTIES OF DDT

The first important point in this brief history is to emphasize that in the days of our scientific innocence, the discovery of the entomological consequences of DDT was regarded by the leaders of the Swedish Scientific World and most of the World's scientific community as well as deserving of the highest award for scientific achievement.

Let us now define DDT and examine its properties.

Pesticides have been utilized by man from the time of early recorded history and it might be well to emphasize here that the discovery of agriculture by prehistoric man was perhaps the first serious excursion by man to the area of massive ecological upset. More serious and pertinent to these discussions was the discovery of the organic pesticides and particularly of the chlorinated hydrocarbons which date roughly to the time of World War II.

DDT was first synthesized by a German Chemist Beidler in 1874 where it remained on some laboratory shelf and as a literature reference until World War II.

A Swiss Group headed by Paul Mueller discovered the insecticidal properties of DDT in 1939. For this discovery the Nobel Prize was awarded Dr. Mueller in 1948.

Chemically, DDT is Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane. It is conventionally represented as this:



pp' DDT

The technical product is a white waxy crystalline material with a slight, not unpleasant odor. It is a mixture of compounds and the active ingredient, the isomer above, comprises 85-90% of the product.

Listed below are those physical and chemical properties that account for its being the subject of discussion today:

PERTINENT PHYSICAL AND CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

1. It is very soluble in oils, fats, organic solvents.

2. It is very insoluble in H₂O about 1 part per billion.

3. It easily 'steam' distills from water.

4. Although of low volatility, enough distills from plant and soil surfaces to be carried by air currents.

5. It tends to form stable aerosols.

SOME BIOLOGICAL FACTS FOLLOW

1. It affects the nervous system of arthropods.

2. The mechanism of its action is not understood.

3. It is relatively safe to mammals. Its acute and chronic mammalian toxicity has been measured for many species.

4. It is generally toxic to fishes—usually at levels considerably above its solubility in H₂O.

5. It concentrates in fatty tissues. Through this partitioning it accumulates in higher and higher concentrations in those predator animals that are at the top of any given eco system. Hence, it is highest in species such as man, Coho Salmon, carnivorous birds, particularly those that feed on marine life, etc.

6. It degrades, but slowly, in most biological systems. It is acted upon by liver enzymes. However, because of its storage in body fats, only small quantities are made available at any one time for detoxification mechanisms. In mammals loss of hydrochloric acid, (DDE) and formation of a water soluble acid does occur along with other transformations. Most of us have reached a steady state for DDT concentration in our tissue. The level in body fat in the U.S. is, on the average, 12 ppm. It is lower in most other parts of the world but higher in a few.

7. Because of the stability of DDT and a wide spread usage, insect resistance to DDT is a fact. It is requiring higher and higher doses in programs for insect control. Adaptations are resulting probably for other animal species also.

As a consequence of the physical, chemical and biological properties we can establish some ecological facts and consequences.

1. The half life of DDT in the total biosphere is roughly 5 to 10 years. This is an estimated average for soil, air, sea and living species therein.

2. DDT has been produced at roughly the rate of 100 x 10⁶ lbs. per year (U.S.) (186 x 10⁶) maximum rate during the last decade. [Prod. is diminishing now, 30 x 10⁶ lbs. used in U.S. in 1968, 2.5 x 10⁶ in Calif.] It therefore has accumulated in the environment. It is in the soil, the seas and to a lesser extent in the air. It is found as indicated previously, in highest concentrations in those species that are at the top of their eco systems.

PUBLIC HEALTH ASPECTS

It is not necessary to dwell at length before a group such as this on the use of DDT in the areas of public health. Yet some mention must be made if we are to examine the problem in its totality. DDT has unquestionably saved millions of lives. It has reduced the incidence of typhus (Naples, World War II, for example), malaria, yellow fever, encephalitis, etc.

Of 1.6 billion people living today in previously known malarious areas, 632 million, 39.5% are now living in malarious free environment. 618 million, another 38.6%, are living in protected areas where programs are going on currently (1). Such statistics can be multiplied. They merit consideration.

One might ask, Yes these lives have been saved as the disease incidence has been reduced, but at what cost? This is a proper question, but the above statistics and many similar ones must appear in the equation which deals with its solution.

AGRICULTURAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

We now come to the agricultural use of DDT. The figures cited for agricultural productivity in the U.S. are objective and I believe impartial. The increase reflects the impact of scientific technology on agriculture

*Presented at Thorne Ecological Foundation, Seminar on Environmental Arts and Sciences June 27-July 2, 1969, Aspen, Colorado.

and are the result of an integrated attack that includes genetics of plant breeding, chemical pesticides, fertilizers, agricultural engineering, etc., etc.

Let us look at some productivity figures (2). We will compare productivity for the years 1947-51 with the period 1962-66. These are the years when DDT and the chlorinated hydrocarbons were first mass introduced and later when they were employed at maximum rates. We do not claim total dependence for these changes on the pesticides, but they certainly contributed in varying degrees to this most remarkable record.

		Yield, per acre	
Unit		1947-51	1962-66
Crop:			
Corn	Bushel	36.5	68.1
Wheat	do	16.0	25.9
Potato (white)	Hundred weight	137.6	198.0
Cotton lint	Pound	279.6	499.8
		(760.0)	(1,100.1)
Rice	do	2,211.6	4,073.8
Live stock:			
Dairy cows (milk)	do	5,194.0	8,122.0
Poultry (eggs)	Number	169.0	216.0

Some of you here have ancestors who migrated to America because starvation was rampant in Ireland in the 1840's. No medicine—pesticide existed at that time for the control of *Phytophthora infestans*, the organism responsible for potato late blight. Excellent chemicals now exist that effectively control this disease and contribute largely to yield increase. The cotton increases more directly reflect the impact of DDT and the chlorinated hydrocarbons.

These are U.S. average figures. In California where intensive chemical, pesticidal, and fertilizer use is employed, the parenthesized figures are the comparative cotton yields in the chart. Where more intense scientific agriculture is practiced, the yields are always much higher.

These figures are from a USDA bulletin published in Jan. 1969 and entitled, "An Analysis of Agricultural Research in Relation to Increasing Demands for Agricultural Products". The results reflect in themselves, a great research triumph. Let it be known that the one area, in addition to the freedom of our institutions, where America truly leads the world, where the communist world is most lagging and most envious is in the area of Agricultural productivity and not industrial or military might.

SOME UNDESIRABLE CONSEQUENCES OF DDT, TRUE AND QUESTIONABLE

There is no doubt about the persistence of DDT in the environment and its spread to the whole biosphere. These are 'hard' scientific facts. We will try to distinguish now between such facts and evidence that establish at best a 'prima facie' case and at worst are interpreted incorrectly and with misleading conclusions. The concentration in part per million (ppm) of DDT and metabolites in the tissue of certain hawks, the Peregrine falcon, many fish species, and man, among others, is fact. The population reduction of certain bird species to the point of extinction is undeniably true.

What has not as yet been conclusively established, is whether DDT truly is the sole causative agent for these tragedies. [I personally am inclined to believe that it contributes to them but by no means has unequivocal scientific proof been achieved.] One can publish population figures and DDT concentrations found for any given species or group of species. In almost all of these investigations, DDT and its metabolites are the only chemicals searched for in the analysis, yet bird species have been dwindling long before the advent of DDT. Is it not man and the total degradation of the environment more directly the cause? We will have more

to say about this later. It is hard fact that DDT concentrates in the tissue of the peregrine falcon. Also, it appears that shell thickness and the viability of their embryos have been diminished. It is equally a hard fact that hens and turkeys subjected to high concentrations of DDT evidence no lessening of shell thickness or of their embryo viability. This can be interpreted as either just another case of species specificity or it can throw doubt as to the causative mechanism.

In another area, papers have been published making the claim that DDT and its metabolites are carcinogens and mutagens. If one subjects an organism to abnormally high concentrations of a chemical (usually unnaturally introduced) then one can observe tumors and perhaps the not well understood phenomenon of chromosome breaking. This is a far cry from a reasonable definition of a substance as a carcinogen or a mutagen. In fact, caffeine produces so called mutagenic effects at lower concentrations and in more species than does DDT. [Since the group that includes coffee and tea drinkers embraces most of the world's population and since most mutations are undesirable, one should be concerned about Mankind's and the world's future!] Seriously, quantitative relationships are required for valid scientific conclusions and precise definitions. Let me describe the interaction between a biological system and a chemical to illustrate this requirement of quantitative relationships.

In the diagram below, the chemical for this species is biocidal, is pathological and is an essential nutrient depending upon the quantitative relationships. (3)

Conclusion of chemical in tissue (dry weight) parts per million:	
Death	3,000
Disease	1,000
Healthy growth	200
Disease	30
Death	0

In this case the chemical is the element Manganese, the biological species includes much plant life and is numerically reasonably accurate for the bean plant. DDT is never a nutrient. But this example refers to the nature of scientific experimentation and the interpretation of the results therefrom. One requires, then, quantitative relationships in the descriptions of biological interactions.

A HOLISTIC APPROACH TO DDT AND THE CHLORINATED HYDROCARBON

It is my intention to emphasize what must be considered, if action is contemplated regarding DDT and the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbons. There is a hierarchy of priorities.

The greatest contribution to the destruction of our environment is prolific man. Much of government planning and economic planning in particular, by business and government, is based on the belief in ever increasing populations. For ecologists this means ultimate disaster. Our influence must be exerted to reverse this trend. What was, at one time, a religious commandment taken from the story of creation on the sixth day—"Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it"—is today just plain evil, unless it is considered in a qualitative rather than a quantitative way. This dominated the ethics of our pioneer ancestors. It presently requires drastic revision. There will have to be regulation, by agreement, or by law, to control population. Until this occurs, the need for agricultural productivity will continue to increase—as will the need for pesticides.

From personal experience, I can report that for ten years, most research (and all of mine and my colleagues') has been directed to supplant the persistent chlorinated hydrocarbons with less persistent, but equally effective, chemicals and even new methods of crop protection. This is a difficult and complex problem and there are boundaries

and parameters within which we must operate. One of these is the cost of food. What proportion of our population would be satisfied with a doubled food bill? Most would not and for the poor, this condition would be intolerable. There are costs for ecological benefits and we must be willing to face them. Until population is stabilized at a given level—and preferably until it is reduced, palliative measures are required. These must take into account food needs, the farmer and agricultural economics, the environment and its preservation, industry and government.

I would advocate for the immediate future, the following:

1. A measured orderly reduction of the use of DDT and the chlorinated hydrocarbons governed by a sound administrative procedure and manned by experts from agriculture, science, including ecology, industry and government. There should be, whenever possible, the preferential use of less persistent pesticides for insect control both for agriculture and public health.

2. I would advocate increased funds for research both to increase productivity and to study more thoroughly the ecological consequences of the measures to be adopted. More work is needed to establish scientifically and quantitatively, the interaction of DDT, chlorinated hydrocarbons and all environmental chemicals toward biological systems.

3. Regulatory agencies FDA, USDA, Health, Education and Welfare have done admirably in (1) protecting the consumer from potentially dangerous levels of pesticides, (2) in protection of the farmer for the growing of his crops and (3) in protection of the general public health. A new dimension to this regulatory authority must be added that protects (4) all the public from the degradation of their common environment. Ultimately this is a UN problem but the start should be with our own regulatory agencies. Policing of the environment is as essential as policing of crop residues.

4. Finally, I would emphasize again, the tremendous need to educate the world and to concern people—in high and low places of the need for population control. This is the fundamental problem and ecologists should provide some leadership in this campaign.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) The U.S. in the Battle Against Malaria, Lebrun, Andrew V. MD, DPH: NAC News and Pesticide Review, 8, 9; March, April 1969.

- (2) An Analysis of Agricultural Research in Relation to Increasing Demand for Agricultural Products, Shaw Byrant, Prod. Res. Report, No. 104, Agricultural Research Service, USDA, Washington, U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, January 1969.

- (3) This chart was derived from data found in: Diagnostic Criteria for Plants and Soils, Div. of Agricultural Sciences, Univ. of Calif. p. 594, 1966.

- (4) Early residue analyses frequently did not distinguish between pp' DDT its isomers and principal metabolites. In this discussion, the term DDT includes all the chlorinated residues. DDE is one of the most persistent metabolites.

VA HOSPITAL CARE PRAISED

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have all had, from time to time, letters relating to instances where individuals were dissatisfied with

the treatment they have received in one of the veterans hospitals administered by the Veterans' Administration. We also know that these incidents almost universally arise out of misunderstandings, human mistakes, fatigue, staff shortages caused by budget limitations, and any number of other similar reasons that become more than understandable when you think that the VA operates the largest hospital chain in the world—and the number of complaints is minimal.

Today, however, I wanted to call the attention of my colleagues to just the opposite kind of letter. This is a letter of high praise for the treatment received by the late Frank M. Allen, Sr., while he was a patient in the Los Angeles VA Center. The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWN: On August 23 my father, Frank M. Allen Sr., passed away at Wadsworth Veterans' Hospital, Sawtelle, after an illness of more than 15 months. Knowing your interest in veterans' affairs I want to express to you the very sincere thanks of my entire family for the wonderful care extended to my father during the long period that he was a patient at the Sawtelle nursing home, Building 113. The doctors, including Dr. Rosenbloom, the nurses, therapists, the other hospital aides were always extremely patient, kind and genuinely considerate both to my father and to members of his family.

I would appreciate it if you would relay my appreciation to the proper administrators within the Veterans Administration both for the care my father received while living and for the dignified manner in which they made arrangements for and conducted the military services at the cemetery following his death.

Sincerely,

FRED D. ALLEN,
Editor, Northeast Newspapers.

I think that we too often forget the wonderful and massive job that is being done in our veterans hospitals throughout the Nation. This extends beyond normal hospital care for sick persons, to affiliation with medical schools, nursing home care, and some of the most sophisticated care and research in kidney diseases, spinal cord injury, open heart surgery, and many other fields.

UNJUST? PHOOEY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the justifiable concern over the adverse effect of the House-passed tax bill on the issue of municipal bonds is effectively explained in an editorial in the August 21, La Grange Citizen, which is proper interpretation of the issue:

UNJUST? PHOOEY

The congress of the United States, now passing through its perennial tax-reform mood, is considering lifting the income tax exemption on municipal bonds.

"How unjust it is," the argument runs, "that the income tax is imposed upon the wage-earner and in those who invest in stocks while the earnings from public bonds are exempt."

Let's give this one a closer scrutiny.

Municipal and school district bonds sell at a lower rate of interest because of this tax-exempt provision. Remove it, and the interest rate would greatly increase.

Major civic improvements are required both by the growth of a community and by the obsolescence of existing facilities. The principal way to finance them, and to extend the cost over several years, is to issue bonds.

Except at ruinous interest rates, this could no longer be done.

The interest charges are met from local levies and the result would be a steep increase in real estate taxes.

From such an arrangement, how could the "average" taxpayer derive any advantage?

A MODEL CITY FOR INDIAN LANDS

HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, a development project covering portions of Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah is under consideration by the Four Corners Regional Commission. The project involves the building of an ultramodern city of 250,000 with the latest techniques of housing, transportation, education, and business. The development, initially planned by former Four Corners Federal Cochairman Orren Beaty, is designed to help the Navajo and Ute Mountain Indians to fully enjoy the benefits of the 20th century.

I include an article published in U.S. News & World Report on June 23 outlining the main features of the development project and I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

A MODERN CITY FOR INDIAN LANDS

A new way of life for tens of thousands of Indians and other Americans is promised in a revolutionary plan drawn up for four Southwestern States. The key: an ultramodern city of 250,000 on what is now barren desert. It's designed to bring a twentieth-century boom to a region with problems rooted deep in the past.

On this rolling desert, where you can drive for miles without seeing a soul, one of the biggest development projects in U.S. history—to include an entirely new city—is being planned.

Covering 288,000 square miles—about 8 per cent of America's land area—the program for the Four Corners Economic Development Region is to include:

An ultramodern city of 250,000, with the latest techniques in housing, transportation, education and business.

A variety of recreation areas, including ski resorts, tourist ranches, and Indian villages and archeological ruins.

A network of new roads and airports that would convert one of the most inaccessible areas of the U.S. into a center of commerce and tourism.

Agricultural projects to make more abundant use of land that is now mainly devoted to sparse grazing.

The work would cost a total of more than 1 billion dollars in both public and private funds.

The plan was developed by the Westinghouse Electric Corporation for the Four Corners Regional Commission, run jointly under the U.S. Department of Commerce and the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah. The proposal is just being made public.

The project's purpose: to pump new life into one of the most desolate yet beautiful areas of the U.S.—the mountains and valleys of the Southwest.

A UNIQUE MONUMENT

Center of the development is a sunny, nearly uninhabited plateau where the four States meet—the only such four-point intersection in the nation. The monument marking the site is about 300 miles southwest of Denver and about the same distance northeast of Phoenix. Here the huge Navajo and Ute Mountain Indian reservations converge.

It was primarily for the mostly impoverished Southwestern Indians and their non-Indian neighbors, many of whom are equally poor, that the project was conceived. It is designed to provide tens of thousands of people with better jobs, housing and living conditions.

"Our idea," says W. D. Brewer, Federal Cochairman of the Four Corners Regional Commission, "is to bring the twentieth century to the Indian, instead of forcing him away from his lands into faraway big cities."

The program is also intended to serve as a model for the entire country in such fields as air pollution, water conservation and urban living.

The development grew out of discussions between U.S. Government officials, including Orren Beaty, former Federal Cochairman of the commission, and residents of the four States who wanted to improve rural conditions.

The commission, created in 1967, hired Westinghouse to study the vast region—one of the most sparsely settled in the U.S. Eighteen per cent of the area's population of 2 million is of Spanish or Mexican origin, about 8 per cent is Indian, and the rest are mainly English-speaking Americans of European ancestry. At the center of the region however, Indians predominate.

The company's survey revealed that the area has an official unemployment rate of more than 6 per cent, nearly double the national average. Some federal officials believe that actual unemployment in the region—counting all those out of work both on and off official lists—is closer to 23 per cent.

There is little manufacturing; agriculture does not provide an adequate living for many, and there are relatively few roads, railroads and airports.

But investigators found important assets, too. The area contains some of the most spectacular scenery in the world—from snow-covered peaks to sand-and-sagebrush deserts.

Thousands of tourists a year come to enjoy the sights—especially the Indian cliff-dwellings at Mesa Verde, Colo., and elsewhere—and travel experts say that more would come if access and facilities were better.

The region was also cited for its largely untapped source of labor. Executives at three plants for light manufacturing which moved into the Navajo Reservation have found that Indian workers are skillful, patient and productive, more than justifying the operations.

URBAN TESTING GROUND

The planners concluded that "a dramatic focus of new activity in the area could best be provided by a new town."

They urged that the community should be not just another city, but a radically new testing ground for novel approaches to urban problems. Their idea was that the benefits would spill out to the entire four-State region.

The city is planned to be somewhere near Four Corners. Preliminary designs call for the community to be divided into "clusters"—residential areas composed of both apartment buildings and individual houses, light-industrial parks, an education area where grade and high schools and possibly a university would be located, and commercial centers.

Other related schools in the area would include vocational training centers designed especially for Indians.

Designs call for the city to have a variety of architecture, ranging from high-rise buildings to low blocks patterned after Indian cliff dwellings.

One proposal provides for stores and offices to be located in one or more clusters, without any specific downtown area. The entire city may be centered around a park, with other open areas throughout the community.

Planners have also suggested a ban on cars in at least some parts of the city. There would be heavy emphasis on public transportation—possibly provided by moving walkways and overhead rail systems. Parking lots may be located at the edge of town—although this and other features may be changed.

WATER AVAILABLE

Engineers report that a water supply—ordinarily one of the biggest problems in the dry Southwest—should be easy to provide. The region sits atop vast underground reserves, and it may be possible to tap the nearby San Juan River. In any case, it is intended that virtually all water in the city would be repurified and recirculated, thus avoiding much of the normal loss.

Employment for 100,000 workers in the city's vicinity, according to plans, would be provided mainly by manufacturers, the recreation industry, service firms, and federal installations.

It is thought that construction could start within the next year or two, with parts of the city functioning by the early '70s.

Planners foresee that the majority of the new population will come from throughout the U.S., and that Indians would comprise a minority of the urban population. Most Indians, it is believed, would prefer to live on their reservations and commute to the city.

Nevertheless, it is argued, there would still be big advantages to the Indians in having a city located close to their homes. The new community is expected to provide the Indians with challenging, well-paying jobs and a variety of educational, medical and cultural benefits now generally lacking on the reservations.

Several smaller "satellite towns" may be established near the city, alongside existing communities such as Farmington and Gallup, N.M., and Cortez and Durango, Colo. Commission officials believe all these cities would grow under the impact of the project.

The city is also expected to become the hub of a large complex of summer and winter resorts. The plan calls for more tourist facilities of all kinds, plus co-ordinated promotion efforts by the four States.

In the process, many new roads and airports are to open up the area to agricultural and mineral development as well. The project includes the construction of new dams, irrigation programs and soil-improvement facilities.

Various ways of financing the development have been advanced. Some planners advocate setting up a joint public and private company, somewhat like the Communications Satellite Corporation, with stock sold to the public.

Other money is to be sought from federal agencies and Congress.

Some work is already under way. A number of roads, medical facilities and schools have been built, and more are under construction or budgeted.

"NOT LIKE LOS ANGELES . . ."

Reaction to the plan so far is mostly favorable. Typical of feelings in the area is that of Raymond Nakai, chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council at Window Rock, Ariz., who says:

"A model city with a limited population—not like Los Angeles or New York—would be good."

"We would like to see the Navajos involved in the planning because we have a lot to contribute."

The Indian leader, who is the head of a fast-growing tribe of 125,000 on a reservation the size of West Virginia, is confident that the Navajos would be willing to provide land for the project if it benefits them.

Mr. Nakai says he personally favors an ultramodern city, not one modeled after Southwestern Indian architecture.

Both the Navajo and Ute Mountain tribes, which own much of the land at the center of the project, say they will take all necessary precautions through their lawyers that their rights are thoroughly protected.

"There will be no Manhattan Island swindles pulled on us," insists one Indian official.

Some opposition to the new city is predicted in neighboring communities which are apprehensive about what the development would do to them.

Farmington's Mayor Boyd F. Scott expresses doubts about some of the plan—particularly where the new city would get its water. He also believes the commission should concentrate harder on assisting the area's existing cities.

"But I doubt," he says, "that there would be any organized opposition here to the new city."

Backers of the project, including Senator Frank E. Moss (Dem.), of Utah, believe Congress will approve substantial funds for the development, especially if industry joins in.

Commission officials know that work has only begun in their effort to reshape America's Southwest. But they are confident that the development will be a success, no matter how hard the fight.

Says New Mexico's Governor David F. Cargo, State Co-Chairman of the commission: "If this works out—and I believe it will—this will be the biggest thing that ever happened to the region. The whole nation will benefit from what happens here."

PRESIDENT NIXON'S WELFARE PROPOSAL

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, about 1 month ago, President Nixon addressed the Nation to present his plans for a major overhaul of our system of public assistance. At that time, his initiative in this area was praised by most Americans who have long sought a change to our present welfare system which has served to perpetuate dependency rather than to encourage self-sufficiency.

On August 11, the Detroit Free Press issued a major editorial statement that thoughtfully analyzed the importance, content, and implications of the President's plan. Although I was unable to bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues before the August recess, I insert it into the RECORD at this point so that this critical discussion can become part of the public dialog on welfare reform:

MR. NIXON'S NEW PLANS SPEAK TO NATION'S NEED

President Nixon's Friday night address to the nation was a remarkable document. The rhetoric was traditional Republican, but the message itself was more radical than virtually

anything done by the Johnson administration.

To say this is not to say that there is any gap between the two. Indeed, the only way to encourage hard work and thrift, to discourage the centralization of power, and to protect government's fiscal condition may well be to do what Mr. Nixon has done—to embrace sweeping social reforms.

For that reason, Mr. Nixon will find little dissent from his bill of indictment against the present welfare system. It is indisputably expensive. Without question it encourages sloth, destroys dignity and perpetuates itself. It fosters illegitimacy and the desertion of families by the father. It encourages people to move from states with low welfare payments to the crowded big cities and the wealthier states.

The welfare system is better than letting people starve, but it fails to fulfill many of its goals and is in fact self-defeating.

So in its place Mr. Nixon would offer a program of "family assistance" which would be based on income level and on the agreement by the applicant to an obligation to accept work if it is available. Though Mr. Nixon draws a distinction between this and the guaranteed annual income, his distinction is more apparent than real. Unless a super-bureaucracy is to be created to police the acceptance of responsibilities by the poor, the system will simply provide a basic floor under the income of every citizen.

By permitting each individual to keep the first \$60 a month he earns above his guarantee, and by forcing him to forfeit only 50 cents of benefits for each dollar of earning thereafter up to a higher level, the system will indeed encourage work.

At the same time Mr. Nixon would establish a federal floor under assistance payments. It may be ironic that he does this even as he calls for decentralization of power, but it is essential that it be done. The federal minimum will end the disparities in how the poor are treated across the country; it will provide one less incentive for the rural poor to move to the cities.

A federal floor may mean that those of us in the states that have tried hard to help the poor will subsidize other states that have been unwilling or unable to do as much. If so, it is worthwhile. It may also, at least ultimately, relieve the governments of states like Michigan from some of the heavy costs of welfare, transferring some of that burden to the federal government.

The reorganization of the job training programs is long overdue, and it tells something about how Mr. Nixon's "new federalism" will work. He is accepting broader responsibilities for the federal government in financing programs to help people, but he would transfer far more of the responsibility of administration to the states. It is an essential distinction, given the allocation of tax resources between the states and the federal government.

Mr. Nixon's concept of federalism reaches its zenith in the idea of tax sharing with the states. He would supplement all the forms of categorical aid with broad grants to the states. This means that schools, for instance, eventually would be getting aid for education, not aid for some specific project.

Anyone familiar with the travail of local government can tell you that this kind of assistance is precisely what is needed—something that will help government meet its fundamental obligations.

It was, then, a sweeping set of proposals that President Nixon laid out, directed, at least in principle, to some of our most fundamental needs. Unfortunately, Mr. Nixon is likely to be caught, as was his predecessor, in a gap between what we decide we should do and what we have money for.

Funds are short; Mr. Nixon does not expect any of this to be done before fiscal '71.

Quite apart from the administrative pitfalls in anything so new and so broad, we may fall short of his hopes simply because the federal government does not have the money to make the new programs work.

But he has made a start, and a good start at that. We are still a long way from welfare reform. The people, though, want reform, and Congress should know it by now. They are finally getting reform of taxes, and they can, if they demand it, get reform of welfare too.

THAT CONTROVERSIAL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, few subjects caused more controversy than the action recently taken by the House in reducing the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 20 percent.

Personally, I believe that all tax incentives should be constantly reviewed in the light of present day realities and accordingly supported the committee recommendation as reasonable under today's circumstances. All of us, however, should be willing to listen attentively to the arguments of those who feel that our action may have been improvident.

For the purpose of providing the Members with a reasoned statement in support of the oil depletion allowances, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD the recent remarks of Mr. James Marine, made over radio station KPOL concerning this controversial topic.

Mr. Marine's statement follows:

THAT CONTROVERSIAL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

I happen to have a slight interest in a company that owns, among other things, a petroleum company, and so I have a more-than-passing interest—and, admittedly, a more-than-passing bias—in efforts to reduce or even repeal outright the depletion allowance now given to all petroleum and other mineral companies. I am aware that practically everybody, it seems, considers the depletion allowance some form of give-away and would love to see it abolished—if only because everybody is in favor of slugging somebody else with higher taxes.

But—even discounting my admitted personal interest—I also am aware that the petroleum companies' side of the story is getting very scant coverage; their side, however, has some reasonable arguments, and they should be heard. For the fact is that petroleum companies—despite this alleged tax break—pay proportionately higher taxes than, for example, manufacturing companies, and earn a lower return on their investments. The fact also is that we undoubtedly would not have the vast reserves of oil and gas we now have if it hadn't been for the depletion allowance, and the cost of oil and gas would be considerably higher.

The depletion allowance was instituted back in 1926 for two purposes: first, to compensate mineral companies for the obvious fact that their capital—minerals—inevitably being depleted and cannot be replenished like other people's capital, and, second, to encourage mineral companies to take the huge risks and spend the billions of dollars needed to seek, acquire and produce their products, by giving them something comparable to the capital-gains inducement all

other companies and individuals now receive.

There's no question that this encouragement—like many other forms of economic pump-priming—has been effective. The petroleum industry estimates, for example, that the nation's oil and gas reserves would be about one-third below what they are now, if oil companies had not received this stimulus—and that could be uncomfortable if only because petroleum currently is the source of about 70% of all the energy used in America.

Furthermore, the depletion allowance—all dramatic war-cries notwithstanding—has not made the petroleum industry any healthier than the rest of the industry.

As a matter of fact, petroleum companies pay a higher percentage of gross revenues in direct taxes, even excluding sales and excise taxes, than do manufacturing companies—about 20% higher. And—again despite alleged windfall—the return on book investment and the return on invested capital average about 10% less for petroleum companies than they do for manufacturing companies.

So, even if you think the petroleum companies are getting an undeserved tax break, it isn't doing them much good.

Now, as I said in the beginning, since I have a slight personal interest in all this, you can, if you wish, take my enthusiasm with a comparable dash of salt—but the facts remain the same, regardless of whatever emotionalism can be generated over the idea of socking big business. And socking big business is the popular thing to do these days.

There are two other facts that also bear considering. If the depletion allowance is reduced, exploration for petroleum undoubtedly will go down, and the retail price of gasoline—which has risen only 10% in the past 40 years, exclusive of taxes—undoubtedly will go up.

These results may be worth the satisfaction of reducing tax incentive for the petroleum industry, and if they are, fine, go ahead and reduce that incentive; at least it would give a break to all the people who don't drive and who don't use oil or gas someplace in their homes.

WEST MIFFLIN OFFICER KILLED

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, 1st Lt. R. Michael Arnovitz, a brave young man from West Mifflin, was recently killed serving his country in Vietnam.

I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing the following article in the RECORD:

WEST MIFFLIN OFFICER KILLED—LATEST CASUALTY IN VIET WAR

A West Mifflin Army officer, whose first child was born only five weeks ago, has been killed in Vietnam, it was learned today.

He is 1st Lt. R. Michael Arnovitz, 23, husband of Gail Griffiths Arnovitz of Elizabeth and son of Dr. and Mrs. Erwin Arnovitz of 300 Park Ave., West Mifflin.

Lt. Arnovitz had been in Vietnam since the end of April and was reported killed Aug. 30.

The officer's wife gave birth to the couple's first child, David, five weeks ago. Lt. and Mrs. Arnovitz were married in December of 1967.

Lt. Arnovitz attended Valley Forge Military Academy and was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in June of last year.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with considerable chagrin that the proposed extension of the west front of the Capitol has again become a matter of perilously immediate concern.

It is my understanding that a House Appropriations Subcommittee has been asked to provide \$2 million to prepare contract specifications for the project—which is now expected to cost a total of \$45 million.

I have objected to the plans to extend the west front and add some 4.5 acres of floor space since they were first put forth in 1966. I have introduced legislation in each Congress since then to establish a Commission on Architecture and Planning for the Capitol so that any further construction on this building and surrounding grounds will be consistent with its historical heritage and artistic tradition and, what is perhaps more important, will be based on the advice of experts.

My objections are no less strong today and I would briefly list a few of the reasons that this \$2 million request is particularly inappropriate:

First. The President has, on the very day that this request was made known, revealed plans to cut back Federal construction work by 75 percent in the interest of curbing inflation. It does not seem quite right that the Congress should consider itself an exception to this decision.

Second. In 1967, the American Institute of Architects issued a report presenting further evidence that the Capitol should be restored in its present form, rather than be extended and substantially altered. The AIA concedes that the building needs to be structurally repaired—and I surely agree that steps should be taken as soon as economic conditions permit to repair the obvious defects in as close to the original manner as possible. But if additional facilities for visitors and additional working space for Members and staffs is necessary, quarters other than the most historic building in the Nation should be found. I might add that optimum utilization of facilities recently built and renovated on Capitol Hill might indicate that the competing space problems of several groups can be solved without costly and drastic alterations. Those of us who have occasion to pass a very lovely—but utterly functionless—park atop the new—and excessively costly—underground garage often wonder at the several possibilities for expansion that exist in that facility.

Third. Finally, the AIA report of 1967 indicated that the Capitol was not, as some have alleged, slipping downhill. It seems highly doubtful that our historic working rooms are going to crumble on top of us before the war in Vietnam is ended, before the 10 million hungry in this Nation are fed, before the 6 mil-

lion substandard housing units are replaced, before meaningful employment is guaranteed for all, before education of quality is available to all children—in short, before all the truly human needs of our people are met.

This Congress has confused the priorities of this Nation for too many years already; let us not compound the error by spending money on unnecessary and damaging construction of the Capitol when there are some of our constituents who lack adequate shelter for themselves and their families.

I include with my remarks an article from the Washington Post of September 5, 1969, concerning this matter. Also an article from the New York Times of the same date:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 5, 1969]

HILL LEADERS PUSH CAPITOL EXTENSION

(By David R. Boldt)

House Speaker John W. McCormack (D-Mass.) has requested the House Appropriations Committee to provide money for the controversial extension of the Capitol West Front, it was learned yesterday.

An Appropriations Subcommittee will hold a hearing Monday on a \$2-million request for funds to prepare contract specifications for the project. The funds could be included in the legislative branch budget for the current fiscal year. The total price tag on the extension has been estimated at around \$45 million.

Disclosure of the move to get started on the extension project came on the same day that President Nixon ordered a 75 per cent reduction in new contracts for federal construction.

The hearing is likely to be the opening episode in a repeat of the legislative battle royal that resulted in the shelving of plans for the extension in 1966. There had been a tacit agreement since then that the plans wouldn't be revived until the Vietnam War was over.

McCormack is one of five members of a commission on the extension of the Capitol that also includes Vice President Spiro Agnew, House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford, Senate Republican Leader Everett M. Dirksen and Architect of the Capitol J. George Stewart.

The commission is understood to have acted several weeks ago after receiving a report showing continued deterioration of the West Front, which includes the only remaining portion of the original Capitol. The report was part of a continuing study being done by Thompson and Lichtner Co., a Brookline, Mass., engineering concern.

The extension would basically involve building a 44-to-88-foot addition to the West Front, which faces the Washington Monument, to house committee rooms, restaurants, auditoriums and offices.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 5, 1969]
PLAN TO EXTEND THE CAPITOL'S WEST FRONT IS REVIVED

WASHINGTON, September 4.—Congressional leaders have decided to go ahead with the multimillion-dollar extension of the west front of the United States Capitol, which had been delayed because of the Vietnam war.

The disclosure of their decision, which is subject to approval by the House and Senate, came as President Nixon was working on details of a 75 per cent cutback in Federal construction work.

The Congressional leaders will ask a House Appropriations subcommittee next Monday for \$2-million to prepare plans for the project. Five years ago, the cost was estimated at about \$35-million.

An engineering survey delivered to Congress Aug. 29 showed that the cracked stone bearing walls have moved horizontally and vertically with changes of temperature and other weather conditions.

The west front was pronounced unsafe years ago, along with the east front, which was subsequently extended and rebuilt in marble at a cost of \$24-million. An engineering company that studied the west front in 1964 noted rapid deterioration and recommended the \$35-million extension as the best way to save it.

The plan touched off a controversy. The American Institute of Architects, among other groups, opposed the project, contending that the original structure should be repaired and preserved for its historical value.

In the ensuing argument, the project was shelved by Congressional leaders because of the Vietnam conflict.

Temporary timber, in place since 1964, is shoring up key spots along the cracked sandstone of the west front.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY JOINS ANTISMOG SUIT

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, recently, joined by 18 of my colleagues, I wrote to Attorney General John Mitchell expressing concern about reports that the Department of Justice was considering entering into a consent decree compromising its antitrust action against the major automobile manufacturers over air pollution control devices.

The Los Angeles Board of Supervisors will intervene in the lawsuit on behalf of the public along with ASH, an organization which has fought cigarette advertising for so long.

I am inserting a copy of an article from the New York Times announcing the intervention of the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors along with a copy of the motion to intervene by ASH.

These actions are commendable and are examples of what each of us, in our respective capacities, can do to make this planet a cleaner and healthier place to live.

The above-mentioned material follows:

LOS ANGELES COUNTY JOINS ANTISMOG SUIT

LOS ANGELES, September 5.—Officials announced today that Los Angeles County would intervene in the Federal Government's pending smog antitrust suit against the automobile industry "to prevent the suit being swept under the rug."

The original action was brought by the Department of Justice's Antitrust Division in the United States District Court here last January. It sought an injunction to end the principal car manufacturers' alleged conspiracy to delay development of antismog equipment.

There had been unofficial reports lately to reach a settlement of the action short of trial.

County Supervisor Kenneth Hahn said at a news conference that county counsel were preparing a formal application to join in the action and to press not only the demand for an injunction but also a plea for monetary damages, which the Federal authorities had not sought.

Mr. Hahn said \$100-million would be asked as compensation for obstruction of the county's \$60-million antismog program, for the consequences of "inadequate" fume suppressing equipment on cars back to 1953, and for "large sums" spent by the county to treat people, particularly indigents, for smog-induced ailments.

[U.S. District Court, Central District of California]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, v. AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.; GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION; FORD MOTOR COMPANY; CHRYSLER CORPORATION; AND AMERICAN MOTORS CORPORATION, DEFENDANTS

(Civil No. 69-75-JWC, filed January 10, 1969)

MOTION TO INTERVENE

Petitioner ASH, pursuant to Rule 24(b) (2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, respectfully moves this court for permission to intervene for the purpose of opposing any application to terminate this action by a consent decree. In support of this motion petitioner respectfully submits a pleading setting forth the claim for which intervention is sought, an affidavit of its counsel and chief executive officer, and supporting documents, and states as follows:

(1) The instant civil action is the result of a two-year investigation by a federal grand jury aided by six Justice Department investigators. Originally the investigating attorney recommended that criminal indictments be sought against some or all of the defendants but this suggestion was rejected for reasons not directly related to the strength of the case.

(2) The court will recognize—and may almost take judicial notice—that an action of this type against all of the major automobile manufacturers in the country for their alleged responsibility for a great share of the blame for the injury to human health caused by air pollution and for many millions of dollars in economic injury resulting from automobile air pollution involves very important political considerations and may result in significant economic and political pressures. For these reasons the action was not filed until the very last days of President Johnson's administration.

(3) It has been reliably reported by eighteen Members of the United States Congress that there are "persistent and disquieting reports that the Justice Department is about to compromise one of the most important antitrust cases affecting the health and welfare of the American people" and that "the entire incident will be covered over by a legal deal arranged between the [Justice] Department and the AMA's [Automobile Manufacturers Association] Washington counsel."

(4) This action involves many important and vital considerations of the public interest above and beyond the violation of the antitrust laws in the manufacturing area, and these important and vital interests may not be adequately represented by the Department of Justice. As noted by the above mentioned eighteen Members of Congress:

"The automobile is responsible for the dumping of more than 90 million tons of pollutants into the atmosphere each year, more than twice as much as any other single polluter. . . . The automobile accounts for 91 percent of all carbon monoxide, 63 percent of all unburned hydrocarbons and 48 percent of the oxides of nitrogen emitted from all sources. . . . Doctors, in a single year, advised 10,000 people to move away from Los Angeles because of the harmful effects of air pollution. . . . Air pollution—of which motor vehicles account for approximately 50 percent nationally—contains serious toxic substances associated with higher rates of

illness and mortality from emphysema, lung cancer."

(5) Because of the seriousness of these charges and the important public interest considerations involved, it is imperative that there be a public trial of all of the facts and that civil penalties be imposed by the court. Without such a trial and the presentation of evidence which only the Government can gather and adequately present, the rights of millions of people whose health has been adversely affected by the action of the defendants, and the rights of many more who have suffered and can establish direct economic injury as a result of the defendants' actions will be adversely and irrevocably affected. It is for these reasons that ASH now petitions the court for permission to intervene.

(6) ASH is a nationally known, non-profit, tax-exempt organization formed to take and participate in legal actions concerned with important problems of health, safety, and public welfare so that important segments of the public interest will be adequately represented in court cases and administrative proceedings involving these areas. Its Sponsors include many of the country's most prominent physicians and health educators as well as other influential citizens from many walks of life. Its most noteworthy activities to date have been in the area of smoking where it was responsible for successfully defending the decision of the Federal Communications Commission requiring free time for the antismoking messages on radio and television [Banzhaf v. F.C.C., 405 F. 2d 1082 (1968)]. ASH has filed and prosecuted over a dozen actions in its own name before the Federal Communications Commission and has filed a number of complaints with the Federal Trade Commission. ASH acts on an informal basis as a spokesman and legal action arm for numerous health organizations. Its activities have been reported in most major newspapers and news magazines including Time and Newsweek, and it has been praised editorially in a number of leading publications such as the Christian Science Monitor, Saturday Review, and the New England Journal of Medicine for its legal activities in the public health field.

(6) For all of the above stated reasons, ASH now respectfully petitions the court for permission to intervene for the purpose of opposing any move by the parties to settle this action by a consent decree which would avoid a trial and withhold information of vital interest to millions of those who suffered as a result of the actions of the defendant auto companies. In support whereof is attached, as required by 24(c) F.R.C.P., a pleading setting for a claim in the nature of a class action on behalf of those whose health has been injured by the actions of the defendants.

(7) Petitioner respectfully advises the court that it does not seek to intervene for the purpose of participating in the normal prosecution of the action or in any way delaying the proceedings except in so far as it will oppose, by argument and the presentation of authorities and information, the approval by the court of a consent decree. Pursuant to 24(b) F.R.C.P. this court must consider whether such intervention would "unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the rights of the original parties." It is respectfully suggested that the effect will be just the opposite; that the plaintiffs, the citizens of the United States, may not be completely and adequately protected with respect to all of their rights by the Department of Justice and that petitioners intervention for this limited purpose will further protect these rights and promote the just administration of justice.

For all the aforesaid reasons, petitioner ASH respectfully requests the court to grant its request to intervene for the purpose of opposing the settlement of this action by consent decree and to order that a copy of all

further papers be served upon it as a party. Should this motion be opposed, petitioner respectfully requests the opportunity to reply with additional argument, information, and authorities.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN F. BANZHAF III,
Attorney for Petitioner ASH.

U.S. District Court, Central District of California

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, v. AUTOMOBILE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, INC.; GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION; FORD MOTOR COMPANY; CHRYSLER CORPORATION; AND AMERICAN MOTORS CORPORATION, DEFENDANTS.

(Civil No. 69-75-JWC, Filed: January 10, 1969)

COMPLAINT OF INTERVENOR ASH

Intervenor ASH, on behalf of itself, its Trustees, Executive Director, and all other Americans whose health has been adversely affected by additional air pollution caused by the acts of the defendants hereinafter alleged, and on behalf of all Americans whose right to a clean and healthy environment has also been denied thereby, joins this civil action against the defendants named herein and alleges as follows:

[Petitioner ASH adopts as its own all of the allegations made by the complainant, the United States of America by the Department of Justice, in its complaint filed on January 10, 1969.]

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN F. BANZHAF III,
Attorney for Petitioner ASH.

AFFIDAVIT AND CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

John F. Banzhaf III, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

(1) I am an attorney and a member of the Bars of New York and the District of Columbia.

(2) I am the Executive Director and legal counsel of ASH.

(3) I have prepared, read, and am familiar with the attached Motion to Intervene and the statements therein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

(4) I have today served upon the defendants a copy of the attached Motion to Intervene together with all attachments by mailing a copy to each of the following by first class mail, postage prepaid:

Lloyd Cutler, Esq., Attorney for AMA, 900 17th St., N.W., Washington, D.C.

Chief Counsel, Chrysler Corp., P.O. Box 1919, Detroit, Mich. 48231.

Chief Counsel, General Motors Corp., 3044 W. Grand Blvd., Detroit, Mich. 48202.

Chief Counsel, American Motors Corp., 14250 Plymouth Rd., Detroit, Mich.

Chief Counsel, Ford Motor Company, The American Road, Dearborn, Mich. 48121.

Mr. Hollander, Dept. of Justice, Washington, D.C.

JOHN F. BANZHAF III.

Sworn to before me on this 4th day of September 1969 in the District of Columbia.

SAMUEL E. LUDERMAN,
Notary Public.

HUGE TRACTOR-TRAILER COMBINATIONS RAISE QUESTIONS ON TRUCK SIZE GOALS

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner in a recent editorial reported that huge three-trailer rigs are

undergoing experimental use in the State of Washington.

The Banner considers this significant in view of the fact that the trucking industry generally is pushing for two-trailer combinations.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the editorial in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

HIGHWAY BOXCARS: NEXT, TRIPLE RIGS?

The Des Moines Register notes editorially that:

"Mammoth 94-foot-long, three-trailer rigs are plying Interstate 5 in Washington state. In a 90-day trial, the Washington Highway Commission has granted special permits allowing nine triple-bottom tractor-trailer combinations on that state's busiest Interstate highway—from the Oregon border through Tacoma and Seattle north to Canada."

There is more surprise at the permission granted than at the industry's enlargement of vehicle plans on its drawing-board; for use, note it, on highways, built at public expense, for public safety and convenience. It is significant, surely, that this thrust for three-trailer rigs (correspondingly longer) occurs while the industry still is pushing for legalization of the two-unit highway train beyond the few states where they now are legal.

In Tennessee, for example, the proposal encountered stiff resistance—by concerned citizens and the state, itself—when sponsors brought it before the legislature this year. That was predicated on the idea of extending the legal limit (in Tennessee) from 55 to 65 feet, and permit the tandem rigs. Even in Congress, where a 70-foot limit has been suggested as a federally-authorized maximum, that measure has not cleared the House Public Works Committee.

Ostensibly there is a federal area of responsibility on standards requisite to highway use on the Interstates—and some concern, surely, for what outside vehicles will do to considerations of safety and maintenance costs. Yet out in Washington state, the experiment goes on, with 94-foot-long, three-trailer rigs.

The Register appends its own pertinent paragraph:

"Judging by past performance, the trucking interests pushing triple-bottoms will try to pick off other states one by one, if their experiment in Washington wins approval there."

POWERPLANT SITING AUTHORITY SUGGESTED FOR CALIFORNIA

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, my office has received numerous inquiries concerning a letter sent by Representative HOLIFIELD and myself to the Governor of California under date of August 5. Because of this interest I have asked that it be reproduced below:

AUGUST 5, 1969.

Re: Power Plant Siting in California.

HON. RONALD REAGAN,
Governor of California, The Capital, Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR REAGAN: The need for coordinated, long-range planning for thermal power plant sites is becoming critical nationwide, but nowhere is this need more obvious and more urgent than in California. The decreasing availability of waterfront

property, the shortage of condenser cooling water, the rising cost of land and the unique seismic problems of the state, combined with the rapidly growing demand for electricity, make California's problem increasingly acute.

But in almost every state, indeed in every region of the country, some or all of these same circumstances are combining to create similar siting complications. As evidence of the growing national concern over the availability of power plant sites, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently cited several reports on the subject.

The committee quoted the President's Office of Science and Technology:

"The need for coordinated planning to identify the prime sites that will best satisfy the many economic and environmental requirements for future plants is rather obvious."

Ex-Chairman Lee White of the Federal Power Commission:

"Electric utilities can no longer select a site for a generating plant exclusively on the basis of where it fits most effectively from the point of view of system design."

And McGraw-Hill's *Electrical World* magazine,

"One of the utility industry's most pressing needs is for a long-term policy approach that will assure the availability of generation plant sites in the decades ahead."

Then concluded that in its eyes, the problem has already passed the "worrisome" stage and is becoming critical. The Joint Committee then added its own warning:

"Therefore, the committee urges that the Nation's electric utilities and appropriate agencies of the government at all levels redouble their efforts and join forces to establish realistic, long-range plans for the selection and utilization of sites for large generating facilities so as to best meet the dual public demand for electric power and environmental protection."

In California siting problems plague every new thermal power plant—oil, natural gas or nuclear—but are particularly critical as to nuclear plants because of special and stringent siting requirements imposed by the Atomic Energy Commission. We believe that nuclear power will necessarily play an increasingly larger role as California's future electric power source. This is because of (a) the anticipated economic improvements in the current generation of light water reactors (b) the advent of the highly efficient and economic fast breeder reactors, and (c) the deep public concern over air pollution. Thus, if California is to remain a low-cost power area—indeed, even if its rapidly increasing power demands are to be met at all—nuclear plant siting must be given a high priority.

It is toward this end that this letter is written.

California faces an extraordinary growth in electrical power demands during the next 20-30 years—possibly amounting to five times present requirements. In many ways, the state's prospective electrical power needs are similar in magnitude to the water needs which faced the southern portion of the state earlier in this century. The courage and foresight of the Metropolitan Water District planners solved Southern California's water shortage problems for decades. Then later similar courage and foresight carried to fruition the Statewide Water Plan to satisfy even more expanded needs. As we see it, similar imaginative pioneering effort in the area of power plant siting is required to assure adequate electrical power for the future growth of the state and for the necessities of its citizens.

We note with approval that the state, through its Resources Agency, has evidenced concern for elements of the siting problem by establishing a Power Plant Siting Committee and adopting a policy statement of

objectives and principles regarding location and operation of thermal power plants. It is also the policy of the state to encourage the use of nuclear energy, recognizing that such a use has the potential of providing direct economic benefit to the public by helping to conserve fossil fuel reserves and promoting air cleanliness.

The Power Plant Siting Committee, composed of representatives of the Departments of Conservation, Fish and Game, Harbors and Watercraft, Parks and Recreation, Public Health, Water Resources, State Lands Division, Air Resources Board, Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards, is charged with assuring that State policy with respect to the location and operation of thermal power plants is carried out. That policy is to enhance the public benefits and protect against or minimize adverse effects on the public, on the ecology of the land and its wildlife, and on the ecology of state waters and their aquatic life. Also, it is state policy that the public's opportunity to enjoy the material, physical and aesthetic benefits of these resources should be protected to the greatest extent feasible.

However, neither the State Policy on Thermal Power Plants nor the Power Plant Siting Committee directs itself toward supplying the need for sites on which massive amounts of new generating capacity can be located. The focus of State Policy and of the Committee is on assuring that power plant sites proposed from time to time, as individual electric utilities locate them, are not unduly offensive to aesthetics and to the environment. This is done on a plant-by-plant basis, with the Siting Committee exercising something of a veto over a utility's plans. Clearly what is called for is a statewide program aggressively to assure that sufficient numbers of suitable power plant sites actually become available to meet the state's requirements through the end of this century. Such a task may involve not only ascertainment and acquisition of locations which are physically and economically suitable for power plant construction, but also exercise of the governmental powers of the state to resolve conflicting demands (a) for preservation and conservation, and (b) for necessary and adequate electric power generating capacity.

To accomplish this, we feel that a three-faceted program is needed.

First, the state should establish a Power Plant Siting Authority, either on a statewide or, if necessary, interstate or regional basis, which is capable of assuring that the long-range need for sites is fulfilled.

Second, the Siting Authority should assess the state's electrical load growth to the end of this century, inventory the available sites for such future growth and, if there is a deficit, identify, purchase and develop sufficient land suitable for the installation of power plants to meet the deficit, which land would be permanently set aside as "Power Parks."

And, third, the Siting Authority should possess and exercise the power to resolve any conflicts which may arise between the public's need for electric power and other public values.

We believe that such a program would assure the state of adequate power plant sites, particularly nuclear power plant sites, for the foreseeable future and would serve as a model for other states and regions of the nation. Further, we believe that only such a program can provide such assurance in California because the special situations we face.

POWERPLANT SITING AUTHORITY

We envision that the proposed Power Plant Siting Authority would not only acquire and develop necessary Power Parks to meet needs to the year 2000, as previously suggested, but assuming the success of its efforts, continue its basic functions thereafter. Depending on

any number of contingencies it may have to select and obtain locations outside as well as inside the state, in which event it would be desirable to engage in cooperative efforts with neighboring states.

It is to be noted that the development of any particular Power Park may require expenditures in addition to mere property acquisition.

For instance, provision of adequate cooling water or cooling towers for the park in its fully developed configuration may require installation at the time the first generating unit is constructed of cooling facilities in excess of immediate need in order to achieve overall economies in providing cooling facilities at time of full utilization.

Or, to make a particular park at a seaside location acceptable it may be most economic to install common protection against great tidal waves for all later generating stations at the time an initial unit is installed.

As another example, to make a location acceptable at all, considering certain seismic conditions against which engineered safeguards can be devised, it might be desirable for the Siting Authority rather than the individual installing utilities to bear the cost of incorporating the safeguards in each plant when it is built. The same would be true for extra engineered safeguards appropriate for metropolitan siting. These extra costs then would be shared rateably by all the state's utilities in the form of a single standard charge for site use, irrespective of its actual location or characteristics.

Our thought is that siting is a statewide problem and that no particular electric utility, whether it be publicly or privately owned, should be allowed to pre-empt the cheap and easy sites to the disadvantage of other electric utilities and their customers who would have to pick up the cost of more expensive sites in the form of higher electricity rates. To forestall such inequities we foresee the Siting Authority calculating its total capital and operating costs for all the Power Parks it maintains and levying a standard annual use charge sufficient to recover same, applicable throughout its complex and varying as to a particular utility only as to the amount of capacity it installs in the complex. This non-profit charge would be calculated to fully return to the Authority its capital and operating costs and could be adjusted at annual or other convenient intervals as these costs escalated or diminished.

In carrying out its responsibilities the Siting Authority will require suitable financial powers, including the power to tax and to issue public obligations. It will also need the power of condemnation, as well as certain quasi-judicial powers to resolve conflicts involving the highest and best use of particular locations and resources.

It will be essential for the Siting Authority to monitor technological progress in power generation and the transmission of electricity as such progress may affect size, location, cooling and other characteristics of plant sites. We have in mind such concepts as man-made and floating island siting, underground and underwater siting, multipurpose siting, cryogenic transmission techniques, engineered safeguards against various physical hazards and the like.

POWER PARKS

It is apparent from the difficulties already encountered by electric utilities both in Northern and Southern California that there are precious few areas remaining in the state suitable, from geologic, environmental, population and other technical standpoints, for large power plant complexes or even single plants. Therefore, if the state's utilities are to keep pace with the public's demand for more and more electric power, it is imperative that a common effort be made to identify and set aside those few areas before they become dedicated to other uses.

We believe that concentration of the state's future power capability in a few large

"Power Parks" would permit the use of land areas which might not be economically feasible for a single facility. In part, we are thinking of inland rather than beachfront siting. Inland locations would preserve beachfront areas for recreational and residential uses and probably would attract less public opposition. In addition, it is possible that the cost of a few miles of cooling water inlet and at-sea outlet conduits, although considerable, could be satisfactorily absorbed in a complex of the magnitude under consideration. Undoubtedly this would be prohibitive for a single plant or a small complex.

It is worth noting, as an aside, that the basic concept of ocean cooling water transmission to areas away from the beach front also has a potential for solving pressing cooling water requirements for other industrial and residential needs without further aggravating the potable water supply problem.

We are unable to specify the number of Power Parks which would be required to meet the State's electrical needs through the year 2000. That depends on the size, location and surrounding population density of the areas selected, the size of the parks themselves, estimated load growth and similar factors. This figure will not be known until our site deficit is estimated and a physical review of potential generation locations is made.

ADVANCE SITING CONCEPTS

A most important area of activity for the proposed Siting Agency would be monitoring developments in siting techniques and other concepts which may affect power plant site requirements, size and location. It is certainly not too early to begin serious consideration of some of the more advanced ideas in this area, and perhaps the Siting Authority might be granted some authority to encourage them financially.

The Bolsa Island Nuclear Power and Desalting Project, which was proposed for construction on a man-made island off the coast of Southern California, is one example of the type of siting concepts the future will bring. Despite the demise of that project, we still firmly believe that a demonstration of reactor siting on made-made, offshore islands is a matter of some urgency, particularly in California and other more populous coastal states. We feel that multi-purpose use of such islands for activities, in addition to electric generation and desalting, such as for airports, harbors, yacht basins, industrial parks and the like would optimize their cost-effectiveness.

There are a variety of other siting schemes which should be carefully explored with a view toward the day in the not too distant future when all suitable onshore and near-shore sites are filled.

Other concepts which bear examination include floating power plant islands or ocean bottom siting substantially decoupled from the seabed and possibly constructed by tunneling from the shore.

Should progress with extra-high voltage cryogenic technology make possible very long line transmission accompanied by only moderate line losses and only tolerable probabilities of interruption, then the radius of search for suitable generating site locations will be extended commensurately and the matter of cooperative arrangements with other states will loom larger than now.

We believe that Power Plant Siting Authority and Power Park concepts deserve careful consideration by all parties in California which ultimately will be involved, particularly your office, all public and private electric utilities and the California Power Plant Siting Committee, which undoubtedly has gained some experience and expertise which would be helpful. These are obviously bold ideas, but California's exploding population will make it a critical area of congestion, pollution and increasing need for

water and power. It is not a day too soon to plan for big solutions to the big problems we can foresee.

The subject of this letter being a state responsibility rather than a federal one, we thus bring it to your attention for such initiative as you judge proper. However, as concerned California citizens, as Members of Congress, and particularly as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we stand ready to be of whatever assistance we can.

Very truly yours,

CRAIG HOSMER.
CHET HOLIFIELD.

BARRATT O'HARA

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sadness that I learned of the passing of our distinguished former colleague, Barratt O'Hara.

His was a legendary life, and an era vanished with his death. At the age of 13 he was on a mission to Nicaragua with his father, and joined the Smithsonian expedition to explore the Central American jungle in search of a canal site. Exploration by others later resulted in selection of the Panama route. At the age of 15, aflame with youthful patriotism, he ran away from home to become chief scout for the 33d Michigan Brigade, which followed Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders into Cuba during the Spanish-American War.

Following the war, he returned to graduate from high school, attended the University of Missouri, and later received a law degree from Kent College.

The St. Louis Chronicle hired him as sports editor when he was 20, and he later transferred to Chicago where he became Sunday editor of the Examiner. He edited and published "Chicago magazine," wrote a history of boxing, and became the youngest Lieutenant Governor of Illinois at the age of 30. Briefly, he served as president of a Hollywood motion picture company, but cut this career short to enlist in the Army during World War I. He served with great distinction, was later commissioned as a major, and became judge advocate general of the 15th Division.

Following World War I, he devoted his talents to the practice of law and was recognized as one of the outstanding lawyers of his day. He defended some 300 murder cases of which fewer than 30 of his clients were convicted, and none were executed. The renowned Clarence Darrow once said:

I am envious of only one thing in the world—I wish I had the courage of Barratt O'Hara.

His distinguished career as a Member of this body began at the age of 66. During his 18 years in Congress he demonstrated a keen understanding of the Nation's problems, and was a dedicated defender of the rights of man. He was a tenacious but gracious adversary, and a man of charm, profound wisdom, and gentle humor. He will be sorely missed.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family.

THE PRICE OF CLEAN AIR

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has been one of the outstanding pioneer leaders in the effort to organize a truly national program to eliminate the dangerous impurities in the air we breathe, and to create the kind of clean, wholesome atmosphere we want for ourselves and for our children.

For that reason, I am happy to include in the RECORD at this point an excellent editorial which appeared in the Times recently, entitled "The Price of Clean Air."

The Times editorial writer accurately points to the key element in our national struggle for clean air: the overriding power of an aroused public opinion demanding that effective action be taken by both industry and Government to win the fight against continuing contamination of the environment in which we live. The article follows:

THE PRICE OF CLEAN AIR

"The main battle against smog has been won."—Charles M. Heinen, chief engineer, emission control and chemical development, Chrysler Corp., April 9.

"The peak output of automobile-produced smog in Southern California definitely has passed—and will never be as high again."—Dr. Fred Bowditch, director of emission control, General Motors, Aug. 5.

"The third consecutive smog alert was called Friday in the Los Angeles Basin as a blazing sun continued to cook pollutants in the air."—The Times, Aug. 23.

There is a kind of grim irony in the recent public concern over the potential threat from transportation and storage of military poison gases.

City dwellers throughout the nation already are slowly poisoning themselves by inhaling the air polluted by automobiles. The threat is actual and still unabated.

Nowhere is the peril of auto-caused air pollution more serious than in the Los Angeles Basin.

At least 10,000 persons leave each year on the advice of their physicians. The millions that remain simply suffer and complain that "something must be done."

Something has been done. But not enough and not quickly enough.

Although emission control regulations have brought about a reduction in the total amount of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide, experts say the skies over Los Angeles will not be substantially cleared of pollutants until 1980.

That timetable, however, could be accelerated—if smog sufferers would pay the price.

Air pollution control can be as strict as the people want it to be. California demonstrated that public pressure is stronger than all the auto industry lobbyists when it forced Detroit to install smog control devices.

Congress also was responsive to the collective outrage of Southern Californians who demanded that this state be allowed to set tougher emission standards than the federal requirements.

Although Detroit complains, it will comply with the increasingly stringent regulations set by the Legislature for new cars in the 1970 model year and subsequently. No industry wants to give up its biggest market.

But even with improved devices, the fight against smog moves slowly because a majority of the cars in the Los Angeles Basin still have no exhaust control system at all.

The total of motor vehicles in the basin, moreover, increases by nearly 10% every year.

To achieve a substantial improvement in air quality, therefore, every one of the more than 4 million cars and trucks in Los Angeles County must be equipped with an emission control device in proper working order.

This would mean that every owner of a pre-1966 vehicle would have to assume not only the initial cost of such a device but also the expense of maintenance and at least annual inspection. In Los Angeles County alone, the total price would amount to hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Legislature mandated installation of control equipment on used cars but only if two acceptable devices were available and if their cost did not exceed \$85. Neither condition has been met.

Much more must be done to develop feasible inspection of the control systems installed at the factory. Unlike the crankcase blowby, these devices cannot be properly inspected with a quick look under the hood.

So long as the public insists on buying big cars with excessive horsepower, the fumes they produce can be reduced only by better control equipment subject to periodic maintenance and inspection—until there is a major breakthrough in engines or fuel.

Detroit says that turbine or steam engines or one powered with natural gas are not yet practical and may never be. Oil companies similarly offer little encouragement that pollution can be reduced by modifying present fuels.

Perhaps. But if the public outcry were loud enough, more action would be motivated in industry—and in government. Why is not the federal government doing more independent research in these two areas?

The ultimate cure was proposed by State Sen. Nicholas Petris (D-Alameda) when he proposed that the internal combustion engine be outlawed in California in 1975.

Not long ago, his bill would have drawn nothing but laughter from his colleagues. This year it passed the Senate and had support in the Assembly before being defeated.

Life without one—or two or three—cars seems unthinkable to most Southern Californians. But life may be unbearable if auto-caused air pollutants are not drastically curtailed, and before 1980.

The air can be made cleaner, just as other kinds of environmental pollution can be controlled. But smog will not diminish until the public demands—and supports—corrective action.

H.R. 6967 AND H.R. 8769—NEWS-PAPER PRESERVATION ACT

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 6967, and one which I cosponsored with a number of my colleagues, H.R. 8769, are both identical to H.R. 279.

As a general rule, I favor the antitrust laws and frown upon making exceptions to them. First, because I think exceptions tend to make bad law, and second, because I feel the antitrust laws serve the important function of preserving and promoting competition in our economic system.

However, I believe in this instance, a strong case can be made for exempting joint newspaper operating arrangements from the antitrust laws without doing harm to free competition.

As Members are well aware, these bills

will affect primarily those two newspaper cities where one of the papers is in financial difficulties and likely to cease publication unless it can enter into a joint operating arrangement with its healthy rival, and thus preserve two independent voices for the particular city or area serviced by these papers.

While opponents may argue that this legislation will permit these two papers to set identical advertising and circulation rates, I think we must be practical. Look around you, in nearly every city, where the service and coverage offered are comparable, even though the competing papers are printed and published independently their rates are comparable if not identical and legally so. This is so because no law prevents a business from independently deciding to revise its rates to match those of its competitor. It would only be illegal if they conspired to set the prices as I understand it.

I am no lawyer and I am sure there are other legal aspects to be considered with which I am not familiar, but it seems to me as a nonlawyer that what these bills propose to do detracts little from the antitrust laws in exchange for preserving an independent editorial voice.

Perhaps the strongest motivation for advocating this legislation is my belief, based on what I have been told, that joint operating arrangements will preserve jobs. Where the weaker of the two papers would be likely to cease publication and go out of business, thus eliminating all the jobs that paper created, a joint operation will act to save those jobs, or most of them, which otherwise would have been lost.

Independence of the press has played a large role in helping us maintain our individual freedoms in this country and I believe passage of this legislation will aid in continuing that tradition.

For these reasons, I hope the House will give this legislation its favorable consideration.

SENATOR WILLIAMS ADDRESSES NATIONAL ZIONIST ORGANIZATION

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 31, 1969, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey delivered a major address to the 72d National Convention of the Zionist Organization of America. In a sensitive and realistic manner, Senator WILLIAMS has called upon the United States and the world "to unite with Israel in the pursuit of peace."

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

Early this summer, I visited Yad Vashem, the memorial to the six million. The horror of an insane mind's solution to the "Jewish Problem" was brought home very hard. So was the realization that for thousands of years the world has pursued similar solutions to the "Jewish Problem." Whether it was

Pharoah or Hitler, the Roman Empire, or the Spanish Inquisition, none has succeeded. The will of the Jewish people to survive as a people has overcome.

Here we are in 1969, witnesses to another effort to destroy the Jewish State. Terrorists, harbored by the surrounding Arab states, daily take their heavy toll of civilian lives. Only last week, Jerusalem was subjected to the first mortar attack since the six-day war. Now Nasser and Hussein have called for a holy war, a war whose sole purpose, and let no nation be fooled, whose sole purpose is the destruction of Israel.

With this as the background, we meet here in Los Angeles for the seventy-second national convention of the Zionist Organization of America. The ZOA honors, tonight, a military hero who has fought in three wars in twenty years to defend the Jewish State. On the other hand, the ZOA invites a United States Senator, who is not Jewish, to be a guest speaker.

This, I think, is appropriate. You have a right to hear from the non-Jewish world what our response will be to the latest solution of the "Jewish Problem."

In short, before I dwell on particulars, our response must be a resounding, wholehearted commitment to the continued existence of a secure Israel. Our efforts to solve the Middle East crisis must be centered on one basic premise—Israel's right to life as a state. The other issues, as important as they are, can be solved, perhaps they can even be negotiated. But life itself; the continued integrity of the State of Israel, must be non-negotiable.

As I see the Middle East crisis, in 1969, we must be concerned with three major goals. These goals, succinctly stated are Peace, Security and Development.

During my short stay in Israel, several opportunities arose to discuss the issues of peace with the Prime Minister, Mrs. Meir, with the Foreign Minister, Abba Eban, and with several others, both high government officials and ordinary vitally concerned citizens.

On one thing, more so than anything else, Israel speaks with one clear voice. Peace cannot be achieved in the Middle East by the imposition of the will of the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain, France, any combination of these countries, or any or all of the United Nations. Peace can only be arrived at in Israel when Israel and her Arab neighbors sit down at the peace table and negotiate an across-the-table peace—when Israel and her neighbors both sign the document which assures the secure and continued existence of Israel on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean.

As one reflects on this key position, it becomes more clearly obvious that no other possibility can serve the prospects of peace. We should have learned that lesson a long time ago. Twice before, Israel has permitted other nations to establish the armistice terms in the Middle East. Twice before other nations have "guaranteed" those armistice and cease-fire terms. Twice before, those guarantees have been demonstrated to be worth no more than the paper on which they were written.

It seems to be obvious that the United States, and the Soviet Union—if it will, can play a very useful role in helping to establish and maintain the peace of the Middle East. That role, however, cannot extend to the imposition of the terms of a peace in that area of the world. The United States and the Soviet Union can foster an atmosphere of peace.

For example, the Soviet Union, which now apparently, and for some time, has been the leading influence in several countries of the Middle East, can easily control Nasser's warlike intentions by controlling the armaments he receives. The complete reliance Nasser places on Soviet weaponry was pointed out

by Mrs. Meir when she reminded me that every Israeli killed both during and since the six-day war, was killed by a Russian weapon.

The United States, on the other hand, will do more to foster peace in the Middle East by clearly and unequivocally announcing and reiterating its unreserved commitment to the continued integrity of the State of Israel than by trying to be a power broker in the area. We should have learned our lessons. We raised Hussein on the pedestal of visiting royalty, and continue to curry favor with him. But he still calls for a holy war.

Let the United States and the Soviet Union agree that Israel must continue to exist. Let the United States and the Soviet Union agree that the parties to the dispute must sit down at the peace table to resolve their own differences. And let the United States and Soviet Union agree that they will do all that they can to help all the nations of the Middle East to thrive in peace, not in war.

One cannot help but wonder at the gross folly of mankind. The Soviet Union has just spent \$1 billion in aid to Egypt. Has that aid improved the living conditions of even one human being in Egypt? No, it has not.

That aid, had it been for economic development, could have improved the lot of millions of underprivileged people, an admirable goal. It also would have been a giant step forward in securing peace in the Middle East. It would have offered Egypt the opportunity to feed on the nourishment of economic development rather than on the poisons of bigotry and hatred.

Some have argued that there cannot be a peace until Israel has withdrawn to her pre-1967 borders. Others argue that there cannot be a withdrawal until there is peace. This appears to me to be a fruitless battle of words and slogans.

In the first place, let us analyze the geography and people involved. We are talking about five different locations.

First there is the Golan Heights, left uncultivated for twenty years and used by Syria for only one purpose—namely, to bombard peaceful Israeli farming settlements in the valley below.

Then there is the Sinai Peninsula. Its mineral resources have been minimally exploited by European and American companies. But Egypt's only use for it was as a military threat against Israel, using Sharm-el-Sheikh to seal off the Gulf of Elat.

We move up the Mediterranean Coast to the Gaza Strip: refuge for Palestinian Arabs and natives of Gaza, owing no allegiance to any of the Arab nations. Indeed, the Arab nations will do nothing and have done nothing to improve their lives.

The West Bank of the Jordan, presents a somewhat different problem. First, we must remember that until twenty years ago, it was not part of Jordan, because Jordan did not exist. It is inhabited by Palestinian Arabs, most of whom have no political allegiance to the Bedouin kingdom across the river. It also comprises the idea and population which could benefit most directly from economic ties to Israel.

Last, is the Holy City. If the world, including the Arab world, has an interest in that city, its interest is in the assurance that there will be open access to all holy places, for all religious denominations. I think the world would do well to remember that only since the city was unified two years ago, under Israeli control, has there been that free access.

The fire at the mosque ten days ago is being used by Cairo, Amman and Damascus to demonstrate that the old city of Jerusalem must be returned to Arab hands. If one could blame the ruling government for such things as fires, then the Arabs have no great claim. For, this same mosque was in flames five years ago, as was the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in 1949.

As unfortunate as the fire was, and it is a

loss, not just to the Moslem world, although Moslems are most directly affected, it must be recognized for what it is—an act of an admitted arsonist who attempted the same act two years ago. He was neither an Israeli nor a Jew, though that should be irrelevant.

What is to be done with these territories lying within the cease-fire lines? Recently, the local press in the United States has noted the dispute in Israel over the Labor Party platform regarding the return of conquered territories. This dispute has been fomenting for some time in Israel. Yet the Press in this country tends to make the dispute larger than it is. What I mean is that there does not appear to me to be that much disagreement between Golda Meir and Abba Eban on the one hand, and Moshe Dayan on the other.

Mrs. Meir's position, for example, has not changed since I spoke with her back in May. She said then, as she says now, that Israel will not return Jerusalem; that Israel will never again subject itself to the indefensible position under the Golan Heights, and that regarding all the other conquered territories, as she put it, "Israel will not give back any territory which gives her enemies a natural advantage over Israel."

Her differences with Moshe Dayan appear to be more of a difference in negotiating style and tactics than a difference, necessarily, in the needs of Israeli security. For example, I find it difficult to conceive of the possibility that Mrs. Meir would be any more willing than Moshe Dayan to return control over the Straits of Tiran to Egypt, unconditionally. Yet, Moshe Dayan says so now. Mrs. Meir would rather sit down at the bargaining table without having made that a prior condition to bargaining.

I believe each position has its bargaining advantages and bargaining disadvantages. More important, however, I think, is the realization that Israel in refusing, as she undoubtedly will, to return the Straits of Tiran to Egyptian control, is taking a position which is absolutely vital to her future existence as a secure state in the Middle East.

The same can possibly be said for the Golan Heights. It would be inappropriate, and perhaps even improper for this Senator to suggest that should or what should not be bargainable from Israel's position. I can only reflect on my own feelings, as well as the feelings one must get from residents of the area, as I looked up at the Golan Heights and then looked down from the bunkers to the valley below.

From those bunkers, the Syrian soldiers had clear view and clear range on all of the farming settlements in the valley. And, one should note that that's all there is in that valley—peaceful farming settlements. One man I met, a Moroccan refugee, had had his house shot out from under him three times, yet he doggedly insisted on staying in his "home." Israel, obviously, will never put her farmers in that position again.

The point is really very simple. The only interest the Arab nations have had in the past in these areas has been as a military and political threat to the existence of the State of Israel. If the Arab nations are willing to live in peace with Israel, they will be able to negotiate secure borders. If the Arab nations are not willing to live in peace with Israel, neither the United States nor any country should be agreeable to allowing the Arab nations to use those areas once again to threaten Israel.

Peace, not war, must be our theme. Economic development, not wanton destruction, must be our goal.

When I met with Mrs. Meir, just 3 months ago, she made one comment that has lodged itself in my mind. She said: "No one likes having the only decent flat in a bad neighborhood." She was saying that Israel, rather than fighting with her neighbors, would rather join with them in developing the area.

So many mutual benefits could be derived from joint Israel-Arab efforts in development. Many of the benefits would be of greater significance to the Arabs, at least initially, than to the Israelis.

One typical example came to mind as I travelled through Galilee up to the Golan Heights. To get up to the Heights, you have to cross the "green line." What an appropriate description. Looking down at the valley from the burnt-out Syrian bunkers, you see a sharp dividing line running the full length of the valley. On one side, the Israeli side, the valley is green. Vegetation abounds. Irrigation canals criss-cross the land. On the other side, the land is a pale brown. Although a river runs through this formerly Syrian territory, no crops had been planted.

It is painful to think of what might have been, had the leadership of the Arab countries stopped their war posturing and worked with Israel on land reclamation projects, on projects to develop and control the Jordan River.

One can only imagine the inestimable benefits to be derived by all the nations of the Middle East from Israel's efforts to harness solar energy and to desalinate the area's water supply.

Peaceful relations and joint economic and social development could convert the Middle East from a wasteland into a productive, fertile, habitable land able to support its millions of inhabitants.

And Israel has been ready and willing, indeed even anxious to undertake these joint programs. Israel's alternative is to help to make the entire neighborhood decent. What can the United States, and the Soviet Union, if it will, do to foster such development?

As a United States Senator, one thing comes to mind immediately. A bill has just been introduced which all of us must join in supporting. It offers the realization of a dream, not only Israel's dream, nor a dream for the Middle East, but for all of mankind: aid in Israel's desalination project. The funds were part of the budget sent up to Congress by the outgoing administration. They have not been included, however, in the revised budget. I trust the Congress will rectify that judgment.

The bill would authorize a \$40-million investment by the United States. I say investment, because that's just what it is; an investment in peace and prosperity. Israel is already succeeding in the desalination of 10% brackish waters. If she can improve on that, and convert saltier waters, the entire wasteland can be regained.

Israel has proven that it can be done; on a smaller scale. The United States now has the opportunity of investing in an expansion of this vital program for the benefit of man.

Let's get on with the labors of peace, instead of the agonies of war. Let the United States take the lead in bringing overwhelming moral and political pressure to bear on Nasser, Hussein and the other Arab leaders to compel them to give up their goal of polioicide and to meet the Israelis in direct, across-the-table peace negotiations.

Let the United States, unilaterally, if necessary, demonstrate its faith in the Middle East's future, a future premised on the continued existence of Israel, by investing in her efforts to benefit mankind.

With the new session of the United Nations General Assembly only two weeks away, let the word go forth that the United States is wholeheartedly committed to the continued existence and integrity of a secure, and I stress the word secure, Israel; a State of Israel which can be freed from the ever-present needs to defend her right to exist and can direct her energies to the improvement of her neighborhood, her entire neighborhood.

Let the United States, and the world, for once, unite with Israel in the pursuit of peace.

TRIBUTE TO MISS ESTHER LAZARUS

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend a resident of my congressional district, Miss Esther Lazarus, of 1 Warrenton Road, Baltimore, who retired as director of the Baltimore City Department of Social Services, after 31 years of devoted public service.

The unselfish and dedicated service of this great lady was outlined in a letter to the editor in our Baltimore papers, by Mrs. Inge Falk Barron, of 2100 West Rogers Avenue, Baltimore, Md., which I believe very graphically points out the wonderful service Miss Lazarus rendered to the people of the city of Baltimore. To Miss Lazarus, I extend my own best wishes for health and happiness in her well-earned years of retirement.

I insert Mrs. Barron's letter at this point in the RECORD:

BALTIMORE, MD.

To the Editor.

DEAR SIR: An important era has come to an end in the City of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. Esther Lazarus is retiring as the Director of the Baltimore City Department of Social Services after thirty-one years of devoted public service. It is of course impossible to thank her adequately or give her the recognition she so richly deserves for everything that she has done, nor would she expect this. To her the knowledge that she has served to the best of her ability and has been useful to our community is enough.

Therefore this message is addressed to the community because it may be helpful to everyone to know a little more what the years of Miss Lazarus' directorship have meant to some of us who have been privileged to know her. It may inspire all of us toward a higher standard of excellence no matter what our vocation may be and more important, it may re-awaken in each of us the spirit of compassion and the reverence for life which is inherent in every human being. Her inspiration may lead to a renewal of our youthful idealism and enable all of us to work together to make this a better society for everyone.

Miss Lazarus has administered the Department over the past three decades under circumstances that might have broken the spirit of the staunchest man during periods of unprecedented social, political and economic upheavals. The fact that she has been able to adjust to these changes and to provide the kind of leadership that has anticipated many of them, speaks to her eternal youth and to her greatness. She has made the Baltimore City Department, with the help of a devoted and a loyal staff, into one of the most outstanding institutions in our nation.

Miss Lazarus is a woman small in stature—but with gigantic courage and goodness of heart. She is one of the truly great humanitarians of our times—a woman who cares deeply about all people and who unselfishly devotes all of her energies working for the dignity of man and a better world for everyone.

Esther Lazarus can indeed stand tall in the company of our great national heroes for she has contributed as much to the progress of man's quest for human rights and freedom as the most famous of them. She has fought fearlessly for the right of every

human being to live his life in dignity—free from want and oppression. She has battled constantly against discrimination and has been a pioneer in gaining civil rights for all people. She was an advocate for the poor and the dependent long before it became fashionable. She has encouraged client participation long before it was demanded by the more vocal groups. She has stood up courageously to Governors, Mayors, legislators, bureaucrats, boards, committees, taxpayers and even the press and has sought equal rights and privileges for all people. She has pleaded for an end to poverty and has asked for a decent standard of living for all. She has patiently tried to explain the much-criticized-welfare-program by putting the blame where it belongs—on society!

And yet she has never shirked the responsibility of trying to administer an archaic public assistance system that nobody likes and that is recognized by everyone as being in need of major reforms. She and her staff have always followed the rules and regulations of State and Federal policy but at the same time have worked hard to try to change them. Often they have succeeded. She has been a pioneer and an innovator and many of her ideas have won national and international recognition. She has inspired many people in the profession to become more effective in their jobs, and former alumni of the Baltimore City Department of Social Services are scattered all over the nation. Many follow her philosophy. It is indeed fortunate that she will be able to continue to inspire young social workers and administrators in her new role as a teacher at the University of Maryland School of Social Work.

Miss Lazarus has received many honors and much acclaim and like all great persons she has evoked extreme emotions in people. There are many that love and revere her; there are those who do not. She has often been misunderstood and attacked severely by critics as a symbol of the welfare system. If this has ever affected her she has never shown it. In fact she is equally unconcerned about praise or criticism because she always knows she is doing her very best and that is all that can be expected of any person.

Miss Lazarus is leaving us a great legacy: To her successor, Mr. Maurice Harmon, she is leaving a challenging position, difficult to fill, but with the opportunity to be of great service to many people. To her staff she is leaving a tradition of excellence and a blueprint of plans and ideas that need to be crystallized before being put into practice. To the Mayor and the City Council she is leaving a Department that is outstanding in the nation, staffed by public servants who for the most part truly care about the people they serve and who are committed to the principle of helping people to help themselves. To the community she is leaving a Department that will continue to provide idealistic leadership and fight for social reforms. To all of us she is leaving the challenge to finally realize our own responsibility for the failure of society to serve all of its citizens and the inspiration to carry on her work to bring about the necessary changes. But most of all she is leaving us her faith in the basic goodness of human beings, her firm belief in the dignity of man and her trust that the people of Baltimore and in the State of Maryland have really begun to care what happens in our society and will work hard to make this the kind of community where all people shall have the opportunity to live productively and play their part in bringing about better things for themselves and for their children.

Let us all be worthy of that trust!

Sincerely,

MRS. INGE FALK BARRON.

MASS TRANSIT TRUST FUND

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, when the National Governors Conference on September 2 unanimously supported a trust fund approach to financing urban mass transit systems, I believe the Governors made a significant contribution to the growing national dialog on the vital subject of providing adequate rapid transportation for our citizens who live in major metropolitan population centers.

Few will disagree that mass transit needs a dependable, long-range method of financing, with an assured Federal commitment as a funding guarantee, similar to that provided by our outstanding highway trust fund.

I have supported this approach, and my bill, H.R. 9143, would establish a mass transit trust fund along the lines of the concept endorsed by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

So, I was encouraged to read a fine editorial in a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times, entitled "Transit: A \$10 Billion Answer," which also supported this position.

Because of the importance of this question, I include in the RECORD the Times' editorial:

TRANSIT: A \$10 BILLION ANSWER

(NOTE.—Issue: The Administration transit program looks good on paper. But can systems be built without trust fund financing?)

President Nixon's proposal to drop \$10 billion in public transportation fareboxes both pleased and disappointed officials of local government.

Although no other administration has offered so comprehensive a support program, the means of financing mass transit systems has stirred growing controversy.

Mr. Nixon's own party generally has held that developing alternatives to the private automobile is primarily the responsibility of local jurisdictions. House Republicans even opposed the modest transportation assistance program now in effect.

The Administration bill, however, declares that rapid urbanization "has made the ability of all citizens to move quickly and at reasonable cost an urgent national problem."

Local officials liked the Administration's rhetoric but not the results of White House arguments over financing the 12-year program. The mayors wanted a trust fund, similar to the means of paying for the interstate highway system. What they got was something called "contract authority."

The President's program, in essence, would commit Congress to the spending of \$10 billion in 2-1 matching grants to local jurisdictions for capital outlay and research projects. Funding, however, would be subject to congressional appropriation each year.

Such a plan may look good on paper, the mayors contend, but it provides no basis for the kind of long-term bond financing needed for the building of transit systems. The same argument was made by Transportation Secretary John Volpe, who also pushed for a transit trust fund.

The Times believes that adequate public transportation is so important an urban need that Congress should establish a trust fund to assure stable financing.

As President Nixon himself said "Until we make public transportation an attractive alternative to private car use, we will never be able to build highways fast enough to avoid congestion."

Some of the revenue now going into the highway trust fund for use in urban areas, therefore, should be diverted to the financing of transit system construction. Taxes on highway users would be well spent if they slow the proliferation of vehicles and make city and suburban freeways less congested.

Even with proper financing, the \$10 billion program cannot ease all the traffic jams of a nation whose cities will have another 100 million population by the year 2000. California, for instance, could only expect a maximum of 12½% of the available funds in one year—hardly a bonanza for Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego and other cities.

Yet federal help could be a significant factor in accelerating the Southern California Rapid Transit District's more flexible approach to mass transit, which involves more innovative use of buses as well as other transportation modes.

Congress should act this year on effective financing for alternatives to the private automobile—and the concrete, congestion and fumes it causes.

DON BRUCE: A RARE COMBINATION

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of our friend and former colleague, Hon. Donald C. Bruce, shocked and saddened all who had known him and valued his friendship.

The following tribute, which appeared in the Indianapolis News of September 5, 1969, and was written by M. Stanton Evans, is a moving eulogy to a man who will be sorely missed:

DON BRUCE: A RARE COMBINATION (By Stan Evans)

The many friends of Donald C. Bruce were stunned this week to hear of his passing at the youthful age of 48.

His death is a staggering loss for all who believe in the essentials of limited government and a want firm defense of its principles. No spokesman for the cause of freedom was more eloquent or persuasive in its behalf. To lose a voice like this is a blow to libertarians and conservatives not only here but elsewhere throughout the country.

Bruce was well-known to Indianapolis citizens not only as a two-term congressman who compiled an outstanding record but as a long-time radio broadcaster and public speaker in our city. He rose to prominence as a keen student and opponent of Communism and as a forceful advocate of the free American system and its constitutional balances. His record in Congress was among the best.

Don's passing is particularly hard to believe not only because of his age but because he was a big and active man whose energy seemed inexhaustible. He would generally lose weight during campaign seasons but seldom showed signs of fatigue or illness. This writer saw him less than two months ago at a political gathering and he seemed in all essential respects to be the Don Bruce of old, his zest for tackling the issues before the nation unabated.

What most people will remember about

Don was his unparalleled ability to discuss tough questions with a force and clarity which had enormous political impact. During his congressional campaigns he would do something few other political figures are able to do: Simply sit down in front of a television camera for five minutes and talk directly to the viewers at home, without script or notes.

The sense of timing which allowed him to conduct these sessions within the allotted span of minutes had of course been sharpened by years as a broadcaster. His powers of expression were formed from years of study and a keen intelligence which sorted the data in philosophical perspective. But the effect he had on an audience rose from his own sense of dedicated mission—an urgent concern for America which he transmitted to his listeners.

Don was a rare phenomenon in politics. He based his campaign style and his voting record, not on what he thought was expedient, but on a well-formed understanding of political and economic principle. He stressed this notion in his campaigns for office, which surely must rank among the most issue-oriented in political history. His voting record in Washington was by the same token one of the most consistent ever compiled—a monument to his knowledge and integrity alike.

I remember a radio debate in which Don was asked his qualifications to represent the people of Indianapolis in Congress. Rather than giving the usual replies about how much "aid" he could bring into town, or what he was going to do to assuage this or that interest group, Don cited his study of the free enterprise economics of Ludwig Von Mises and F. A. Hayek.

To find a man who combines philosophical depth with ability to transmit his convictions to the public is unusual in any time or place. It has become even more unusual of late, as "pragmatic" politicians vie with one another to offer the public, not what they consider to be right and just, but what they think is politically useful. Philosophical concern sometimes is not very popular.

Don Bruce, through his remarkable combination of talents, succeeded in making it popular. He demonstrated that the electorate of a large metropolitan area would respond strongly to the cause of conservatism if it were presented clearly by a man who knew the issues and was not afraid to speak out on them. Whatever the "pragmatists" may think, Don showed conclusively that principle makes good politics.

MARYLAND MARINE KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lance Cpl. Michael L. Harp, a fine young man from Maryland was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

PASADENA LANCE CORPORAL KILLED LEADING FIRE TEAM

A Marine lance corporal from Anne Arundel county has been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Lance Cpl. Michael L. Harp, 19, of 1109 Brandon Shore road, Pasadena, was killed by

enemy small arms fire last Thursday while on a search and clear operation with about 200 other marines 5 miles northwest of An Hoa in Quang Nam province.

Corporal Harp was the leader of a four-man "fire team."

He arrived in Vietnam on March 5, 1969, and was a member of E Company, 2d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division.

Corporal Harp enlisted for four years in July, 1968, following his graduation from Northeast High School.

According to his father, Corporal Harp planned to attend college and study oceanography after his four years in the Marines. Mr. Harp had sent his son several books on oceanography after he arrived in Vietnam.

Corporal Harp was stationed at An Hoa. He was promoted to Lance Corporal two days before he was killed.

He was a member of the track team and the Inter-Act Club, a service club, in high school.

SURVIVORS NAMED

He enjoyed hunting, fishing, and water skiing on the Patapsco River, which his home overlooks. He also enjoyed photography. A roll of film arrived at home yesterday which he wanted processed and returned to him in Vietnam.

Corporal Harp is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles K. Harp; a step-brother, Raymond Johnson, of Baltimore; and a half-sister, Mrs. Leslie Kingery, of Baltimore.

He is also survived by a brother, Marine Cpl. David Harp, of Cherry Point, N.C.

EPIC WAS THE VOYAGE

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Newark, N.J. post office paid poetic tribute to the Apollo 11 astronauts with a narrative poem entitled "Epic Was the Voyage," written especially for the occasion by Newark's poet laureate, Larry Pendleton.

In having this tribute printed in the official special orders of the Newark post office department, Postmaster Joseph J. Benucci said:

This is man in his finest hour. We of the Newark Postal District are deeply privileged to so honor our vallant astronauts on the successful completion of their history making flight and walk on the moon.

The poem follows:

EPIC WAS THE VOYAGE (By Larry Pendleton)

Ho! The Sea of Tranquility
Where Man did not hold sway
Until two daring Astronauts
Walked on the moon that day . . .

Nations gasped and gaped in awe
The impossible had been done
Three vallant Voyagers roared thru space
Beneath the scorching sun . . .

Their Lunar module touched-down on moon
The Solar Winds moaned low
Silence filled Time's Great Halls
As they muttered "It is so" . . .

It was an Epic Voyage
All mankind thrilled to see
Puny Man a giant in deed
From moon to earthbound sea . . .

We hail our mighty Astronauts
Our voices raised on high
Almighty God consented
And man vanquished the skies . . .
"Quo Fata Ferunt"

RALLY MARKS STRIKE ANNIVERSARY

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago a brave group of Americans began a small struggle which now has become a major crusade for human rights and dignity.

From out of the hot, dry, dusty grape orchards of California, the founders of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee struck against the growers. That strike now enters its fifth year.

The 4 years have been hard. At times, there was anything but encouragement. But, the strike has lasted, and the victories have been significant. Hopefully, settlement will come soon, and the grape-workers will have won their rights to decent wages and better living and working conditions.

Yesterday, nearly 1,000 residents of the Washington area gathered at the Monument grounds to celebrate the anniversary of the strike's beginning. Among the participants were Members of Congress, who, like myself, have long supported the position of the grapeworkers. Carl Bernstein of the Washington Post was also there, and I would like to insert his story of the rally at this point:

GRAPE STRIKE RALLY ATTRACTS 500—WALKOUT
ENDS 4TH YEAR
(By Carl Bernstein)

Five hundred supporters of the California table-grape boycott—Catholics, Protestants, Jews, agnostics and atheists—drank Pilsner wine from gallon jugs yesterday during an ecumenical Communion service atop the L'Enfant Plaza Safeway.

"Oh Lord, grant that the business executives and the people who control the agribusiness may find the courage and conviction to do justice," intoned the Rev. Richard McSorley of Georgetown University leader of the service.

"Hear us, Lord," responded the shirt-sleeved congregation gathered in and around the L'Enfant Plaza fountain, directly above a Safeway store that, like all of the chain's outlets here, has refused to remove California table grapes from its shelves.

TWO-HOUR PROGRAM

The bread-and-wine service, following a rally at the Sylvan Theater in observance of the fourth anniversary of the United Farm Workers' strike in the California vineyards, was almost as solemn as the earlier gathering had been enthusiastic.

At the outdoor theater on the Washington Monument grounds, the crowd heard two hours of speeches and folk singing in support of California's migrant workers demanding the right to bargain collectively under the UFW's banner.

Urged to sit under yesterday's hot sun as "a reminder of how grape workers feel in the vineyards," the crowd cheered wildly as Rep. James O'Hara (D-Mich.) told them:

"No longer will we permit the California

grape growers to treat our seasonal workers as a subhuman species. . . . The food on our table is covered with the blood and sweat of our farm workers. But we will win this struggle for human dignity."

NO GRAPES AT ALL

Former City Councilman J. C. Turner, who is chairman of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council and cochairman of the Washington Don't Buy Grapes Committee, called on the Nixon administration "to quit buying so many grapes."

"No grapes at all," the crowd chanted back, mindful of an earlier assertion by a strike leader that the Defense Department last year increased the shipment of grapes to soldiers in South Vietnam by 350 per cent.

The rally on the Monument grounds recalled the atmosphere of labor union picnics from another era as the crowd cheered the speakers, sang "We shall Not be Moved" and exhorted strangers not to eat "scab grapes."

The throng was diverse, with boycott supporters drawn from the ranks of organized labor, the old left, the new left, liberal Catholic lay organizations cosponsoring the rally, Mexican-Americans (most of the California migrants are of Mexican descent), the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (another cosponsoring organization), a Zionist youth group ("Habonim Says Don't Buy Grapes," said their sign), and unaffiliated people like the woman who said, "I'm here because people have a right to earn a decent living."

MARCH TO PLAZA

After a prayer by Msgr. George L. Gingras invoking "the God of justice to support the cause of freedom from servitude and the nobility of honest work," the crowd began the march to L'Enfant Plaza.

At the head of the procession were former City Council chairman Walter E. Fauntroy, women in blue-and-white caps from Local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Workers Union, the Rev. Channing E. Phillips, Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.), Father McSorley and other supporters of the Washington boycott that has cut grape consumption here by 10 to 15 per cent, according to proponents.

"No more grapes on tables/no more grapes in the stores/the growers will have to surrender/and we won't have to fight any more," the group sang as they passed the Agriculture Department.

"What about wine, man?" one marcher wanted to know. "That's okay, just table grapes," he was told.

The boycott supporters crowded into the glistening new plaza, then fell silent as Father McSorley began the service with readings honoring Cesar Chavez, leader of the California strike, and the late Sen. Robert Kennedy, who journeyed to California in support of the migrant workers.

"Recall my death and resurrection," Father McSorley continued. Prayers were offered for Safeway, for other grape sellers, for "the grapes of wrath," for peace, for the grape strikers. Then the bread was broken and passed around to all, the greeting "Peace" exchanged as the wine was passed from hand to hand. In the fountain, those who had been frolicking in the water stopped to wash down the bread, then joined hands as the congregation sang "We Shall Overcome."

EPIC WAS THE VOYAGE

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is with justifiable pride that I place into the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poem written by Larry Pendleton, of Newark, N.J. The poem, "Epic Was the Voyage," conveys the grandeur of the astronauts' moon landing.

Mr. Pendleton, who works in the Newark post office, has authored many other poems about various topics, some of which I have seen and admired. I am pleased to be able to make his excellent poem a part of the RECORD:

EPIC WAS THE VOYAGE (By Larry Pendleton)

Ho! The Sea of Tranquility
Where Man did not hold sway
Until two daring Astronauts
Walked on the moon that day . . .

Nations gasped and gaped in awe
The impossible had been done
Three valiant Voyagers roared through space
Beneath the scorching sun . . .

Their Lunar module touched-down on moon
The Solar Winds moaned low
Silence filled Time's Great Halls
As they muttered "It is so" . . .

It was an Epic Voyage
All mankind thrilled to see
Puny Man a giant in deed
From moon to earthbound sea . . .

We hail our mighty Astronauts
Our voices raised on high
Almighty God consented
And man vanquished the skies . . .

"Quo Fata Ferunt"

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE BARRATT O'HARA

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, after a distinguished career as a member of the bar, as a public servant elected to high office in his State, and as a patriot always ready to spring to the defense of his country, the late Barratt O'Hara came to this House as a Member of the 81st Congress, here to further serve his country with distinction.

Those of us who knew him, and I am happy to count myself in that number, knew him to have a strong right arm in defense of the underdog. We knew him to have the great gift of being able to disagree without being disagreeable. We knew him to be a doughty antagonist on occasion and a sympathetic friend.

The career of the former Member was studded with signal honors and great achievements. From the age of 15 when he fought valiantly in the Cuban War for Independence, through service in World War I, and through a remarkable career as defense counsel to the end of his life, Barratt O'Hara dedicated himself to the principals of right and justice.

His polished oratory, delivered without notes, contributed much to the deliberations of the 81st, 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 89th, and 90th Congresses. I was extremely fond of Barratt O'Hara. I considered him a good friend. We chatted together often.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family. It is indeed a privilege to join in

paying tribute to the memory of this distinguished former Member of the Congress.

GEORGE AND THE DRAGON

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Washington-based journalists and, I presume, the reading public are accustomed to the continuous foreign policy harangues of the junior Senator from Arkansas. I was most impressed, therefore, to read a report on the appearance of AFL-CIO President George Meany before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee written by Msgr. George Higgins in the August 15 New World, the publication of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago.

The article follows:

GEORGE AND THE DRAGON

(By George G. Higgins)

George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, has—I almost said "enjoys" the reputation of a man who always says exactly what he thinks, especially to Presidents, Cabinet members, Senators and other political bigwigs.

Meany was running true to form when he appeared recently before the Senate Foreign Relations committee, and took on its chairman, Sen. William Fulbright, in a heated colloquy which lasted about three and a half hours.

The good Senator, who has mercilessly badgered many a Cabinet member on the issue of Vietnam and gotten away with it, finally met his match in Mr. Meany.

I admire Meany for bearing the Arkansas lion in his own privileged den and refusing to be intimidated by his line of questioning.

While I find Mr. Meany's foreign policy too inflexible in certain respects and while I would be inclined to support almost any move to end the war in Vietnam short of outright surrender, I find Senator Fulbright's policy equally inflexible and perhaps even more doctrinaire in its own sophisticated (some say supercilious) way.

When I noted above that I admire Mr. Meany for locking horns with the Senator, I was not referring to the substance of their debate on foreign policy, but rather to the way they carried on the argument.

In my opinion, the Senator argued his case very tendentiously, and, for this reason I am glad that Meany slapped him down in a way that no Cabinet member or other government spokesman would have dared to do under similar circumstances.

The Senator had a perfect right to disagree with Meany's approach to foreign policy, but he had no right to say that heavy government subsidy of the AFL-CIO foreign policy activities through the American Institute for Free Labor Development was a reward for Meany's "ardent, ardent" endorsement of Lyndon Johnson's war policies.

This accusation strikes me as being a rather cheap way of suggesting that Meany is a groveling sycophant. If Fulbright actually believes this, I am afraid he doesn't understand George Meany very well and hasn't the slightest notion of what makes him tick.

Mr. Meany's foreign policy may be good, bad or indifferent, but it's his own policy, and it's not for sale to any Administration.

Senator Fulbright would have discovered this himself if he had ever become Secretary of State and had foolishly tried to bargain with Meany on the issue.

He would have discovered that Meany, rightly or wrongly, was prepared to stick to his guns regardless of what anyone else, including the President, the Secretary of State, or even the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations committee might think about the matter.

Senator Fulbright overstepped the bounds of Congressional propriety and Congressional immunity in suggesting, rather insultingly, that Meany was a Johnson lackey and that Johnson himself was a deliberate bribe in the field of foreign policy.

Moreover, if the Senator thought that Meany, out of deference for the Senate committee and its august chairman, would take all this lying down, he has something to learn about the American political process.

Senators may be able to bulldoze hapless government officials when they have them on the witness stand, but thanks be to God they can't intimidate private citizens of Meany's caliber—men who, right or wrong, have the courage of their convictions and are not respecters of persons.

STORM TRACKERS DESERVE THANKS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my remarks today is to emphasize the last two paragraphs of the following editorial from the August 28 edition of the Florida Times-Union to the effect that many men in the Navy and the Air Force, with true heroism, risked their lives to provide the information and warning which saved the lives of many thousands of persons in the recent Hurricane Camille. My father once supervised the National Hurricane Center when it was established in Jacksonville, Fla., many years ago, so in paying tribute to these military heroes in the hurricane war, I do so with knowledge of what I speak of. The editorial reads as follows:

STORM TRACKERS DESERVE THANKS

There were some unfortunate implications which could be drawn from Vice President Spiro Agnew's comments on Hurricane Camille. We feel certain that these were unforeseen and unintended but they should be cleared up to erase any idea that the Jacksonville-based Hurricane Hunters did not perform their hazardous tasks in the efficient and fearless manner that has marked their performance since they were formed.

Agnew was sent by President Nixon on a fact-finding mission to the Mississippi Gulf Coast in the wake of the strongest storm to hit the U.S. mainland since records have been kept in such matters.

After his report was delivered to the President, he said that Nixon was greatly disturbed that the federal government "was not better able to forecast the intensity and precise destination of the hurricane."

The vice president said the government had found that the Navy storm-hunting planes had excellent meteorological equipment but were not strong enough to stand up against a hurricane with the 200-mile-an-hour winds of Camille.

Agnew added that the Air Force had more durable planes but lacked advanced scientific weather-finding instruments.

It is not at all difficult to find the genesis of his conclusions.

Last Friday, Dr. Robert Simpson, head of the National Hurricane Center, was quoted

in a press interview as saying he gave Agnew "both barrels about what we didn't have and what we need" to improve the center's work. He made a plea—with which we concur—that research funds must be greatly increased from the present \$750,000 annually.

Simpson was also quoted as telling Agnew: "some old Navy Constellations that should have been junked years ago trailed Camille all day Saturday and didn't dare go into the storm because they knew their aircraft couldn't stand up under the pounding." He added that "the pilot was right."

Simpson said he "finally got an Air Force plane in there about 5 p.m. Saturday and it recorded the lowest barometric pressure ever found by any aircraft inside a hurricane of record."

He said he further told Agnew that "the Navy has a wonderful instrument package and lousy airplanes. The Air Force has wonderful planes and lousy instruments. It's past time for somebody in Washington to get everybody together."

We are certain also that Simpson intended no criticism of the performance of the Hurricane Hunters but there are unfortunate implications that could be drawn by anyone who did not fully understand the context and intent of his remarks.

The Navy and the Air Force work together on hurricanes, each with different missions.

Navy Hurricane Hunters go in at low-level, beneath the clouds, where they can actually observe the sea. Depending on the visibility, this is sometimes only 400 feet above the whitecaps.

At this level they not only track the storm, both visually and with radar, but also measure surface winds and sea temperatures.

It is obvious that the safety factor at the lower levels is steadily reduced. Hurricanes have more than horizontal winds. There are vertical drafts, torrential rains and water spouts. Turbulence and the wind factor is generally higher at these low altitudes. There is no margin for error.

For this task they use the Constellation which has the advantage of a flexible wing—the wing actually flaps and there is less chance of it shearing off. At these altitudes they must use maximum engine power to maintain level flight.

The Air Force goes in above 10,000 feet and this is also a hazardous task. In fact one Air Force plane had to limp desperately back to an emergency landing at Houston after penetrating the eye of the hurricane at 30,000 feet.

As far as we can determine, the Navy and Air Force Hurricane Hunters work together well at their different missions, respect each other's work and there is no quarrel between them.

Over the years, the Navy's Weather Reconnaissance Squadron 4 has developed guidelines, culled from years of experience as to the maximum tolerance of the aircraft under the conditions which prevail on their lowlevel missions. The wind guidelines is 120 knots (about 142 miles per hour) and the diameter of the eye must be at least 15 miles for penetration in order to afford room for aircraft maneuverability.

The Navy in this case made every fix assigned to it by the National Hurricane Center on Hurricane Camille before being taken off to assist in Operation Storm Fury—the seeding of Hurricane Debbie in the Atlantic.

Each plane sent out from Jacksonville into Camille spent some 12 hours in the air, most of this time inside and around the parameters of the hurricane.

There is great question—and perhaps the push for better equipment will develop a definitive answer to it—whether any plane now in use (even by the Air Force) could have penetrated the eye of Camille in low level flight and returned.

Camille was tagged as a dangerous storm long before it went ashore on the Gulf Coast and the 5 p.m. Saturday barometric reading

by the Air Force plane would have given at least 24 hours warning.

As to the precise point of entry, it is difficult to see where the planes themselves could provide any more information than they did about the exact point at which the hurricane would make landfall. They tracked its position and direction as ordered. The general Gulf Coast area in which it was predicted progressively moved westward as these tracking reports came in.

Although forecasters have developed hurricane predictions to a great degree of accuracy, the state of the art may never be such as to be able to predict them exactly. To some extent they are predictable but they contain some great unpredictable factors.

There have been hurricanes which looped, which turned south—against all odds—and which have done other things that hurricanes are not supposed to do.

At this point it would be well to emphasize the positive side of the picture. Advance warnings caused some 200,000 persons to flee their homes and held casualties from the worst recorded storm—and one of the most destructive in history—well below the toll of some hurricanes of much lesser strength in the past.

The mainland had not experienced 200 mile an hour winds before and even had doubters in the storm's path been forcibly removed (a step which would have been necessary since some refused to leave despite explicit warnings) the physical destruction would have been enormous.

While recognizing the need for more research funds and for better planes and equipment, the administration would also do well to recognize the fact that many men—Navy and Air Force—risked their lives to provide the warning that was available.

They deserve a ringing vote of thanks.

SICK OR SAFE TOYS?

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a recent newsletter, Mr. Marvin Glass, the Nation's outstanding toy designer, has quite properly pointed out that in our concern over physical safety in toys we have overlooked the need for psychological safety in toys.

Mr. Glass believes that we should direct more attention to the psychological impact of toys on children, such as reducing toys of violence or those that stress materialistic rather than spiritual values. Mr. Glass himself is opposed to toy weapons of war and violence and is conducting a quiet campaign against them by refusing to design any.

I commend the following article to my colleagues:

SICK OR SAFE TOYS?

Legislative concern today over physical safety in toys is like the old legend of the emperor's non-existent clothes. Onlookers are seeing things that are not there and not seeing the startling aspect of what is.

Congress is stressing physical toy hazards that are for the most part non-existent, or unlikely, and is not looking at possible psychological dangers that are.

With this consideration, a new definitive look should be taken at the proposed Toy Safety Act, the joint Moss-Joelson bill which calls for broad regulatory powers over the manufacture of toys.

This is the warning of Marvin Glass, the

nation's outstanding toy designer, who has played a major role in innovating new styles in the toy industry for the past 30 years and whose creations alone this year are expected to account for \$125 million in toy sales.

"Modern toys are generally designed, engineered and manufactured with great precision and precaution," Glass points out. "They are built primarily for use with foreseeable abuse. Most manufacturers are aware of safety in production. This means they watch for possible sharp edges, poisonous substances and dangerous electrical, thermal or mechanical parts in toys. Taking everything into consideration, physical injury to a child from a toy is remote, unless the child uses one to throw at another child."

"On the other hand, many toys are psychologically unsafe. There are numerous toys on the market, such as miniature weapons of war, that condition, if not encourage, future generations to violence and love of power. There are also too many toys that over-emphasize materialistic rather than spiritual values. For example take dolls that stress magnificence in clothes and coiffures, or expensive model cars for boys. Little girls grow up to be real life versions of these dolls, demanding fabulous wardrobes. Boys reach manhood thinking flashy cars are necessary to the right way of life. Such toys advocate conspicuous consumption and are greatly responsible for the present day huge teenage market in clothes, cosmetics and cars."

Glass points out that a toy is a psychological tool that orients a child to reality. It should emphasize the magic of the world around him or the world of the future, the designer says.

"We try for an atmosphere of fun and laughter. If future citizens of the world can be taught to laugh at themselves, then maybe ultimately a world devoid of self-righteous people and war might result."

"Through multi-play toys, we try to teach children cooperation in group effort. These toys stress equal time for play, how to take turns, and the principle that only fair play wins. We hope, also, to orient children to our competitive, capitalistic society with good competitive games of chance, offering reasonable but not speculative risks."

"If a toy isn't psychologically sound, it is psychologically unsafe, possibly even sick with a contagious illness. There is a greater need for regulation in this area than in that of possible physical hazards."

TOWSON, MD., AMERICAN LEGION POST 22 BASEBALL TEAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, American Legion Post 22 of Towson, Md., has sponsored a fine baseball team this year. The young men have just returned from the American Legion World Series where they captured second place. I wish to take this opportunity to honor them.

The team is managed by Louis Grasmick and coached by Thomas Finnegan. Athletic Director Dixon Gaines also contributed to their success. Team members include: Russell Niler, Michael Wyatt, Russell Bryant, Grant Grasmick, Rieck Foelberg, Mark Russo, Hugh Curd, Danny Coyne, Lindsay Graham, Jack Dunn, Joe Lavezza, Michael Kelley, Thomas Heinzerling, Randy Respass, Carl Glaeser, Bruce James, Bob Gulwee, and Lenny Owens.

DANGER SIGNALS: NATION'S WATER SUPPLY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles C. Johnson, Jr., administrator for the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reported recently that as many as eight million people may be drinking water which exceeds Public Health Service criteria for bacteria. Furthermore, Mr. Johnson indicates that as much as 40 percent of the Nation may be drinking water which does not meet other Public Health Service standards for safety and desirability.

The evidence of the steadily worsening condition of our water supply continues to grow. This shocking neglect of our water resources must be reversed now.

A UPI news story and list of water supplies provisionally approved by the Public Health Service follows:

NATION'S WATER SUPPLY

(By Craig A. Palmer)

WASHINGTON.—More than 100 water systems around the country supplying interstate travelers do not fully measure up to Federal standards although they are not considered unsafe, according to a new Government report.

The Public Health Service, which has jurisdiction over municipal and private supplies involving interstate commerce, lists them as "provisionally approved"—inadequate as to bacteria and other content, but usable for drinking and cooking.

UPI obtained the report on request after administrator Charles C. Johnson Jr. of the Government's consumer protection and environmental health service said in a speech: "There is reason for serious concern about community water supplies in the United States."

More recently, Johnson has said the drinking water problem "is growing in seriousness with every year that passes."

The "provisionally approved" classification is applied if major deficiencies are found during monthly tests of water supplies, or if operators of a system have failed to act on recommendations from a previous inspection.

The classification is in effect a warning to state and local officials that the supply in question must be improved if it is to retain government certification.

The water supplies covered by the report are those used by interstate carriers—buses, planes, trains and water craft—either in transit or for passengers in terminals, for either drinking or cooking.

Officials said these sources of water served some two million travelers daily, and some 82 million residents in the local communities where the water systems are located.

No systems are on the forbidden list just now. But 38 per cent on the "provisionally approved" list have failed to meet requirements on bacterial count for a month or longer. And even should a supply be rejected, the Government could effectively bar its use only on interstate public transportation on which water is furnished.

Also, Johnson had this to say:

"The present PHS standards do not reflect the best and latest knowledge of real or potential threats to human health and fall far short of the drinking water quality goals promulgated by the AWWA (American Water Works Association) last year."

On another occasion, Johnson said a 1967 report concluded "that 33 per cent of all public water supplies serving some 50 million persons do not meet the requirements of the Public Health Service's drinking water standards."

Major water systems listed as "provisionally approved" as of July 28, included:

Nome, Alaska; Pueblo, Colo.; Miami Beach; Augusta, Ga.; Worcester, Mass.; Missoula, Mont.; Jersey City and Newark, N.J.; Buffalo, N.Y.; Asheville, N.C.; Altoona, Pa.; San Juan, P.R.; East Providence, R.I.; Charleston, S.C.; Chattanooga, Memphis and Nashville, Tenn.; Charlottesville, and Norfolk, Va.; Salt Lake City; Charleston, W. Va.; La Crosse, Wis., and Sheridan, Wyo.

Although the Public Health Service estimates there are some 22,000 water supplies throughout the country, it has certifying authority over only about one-third of them.

However, the more than 700 supplies it does certify serve about two million travelers daily, and 82 million persons living in the respective communities.

As of April 16, PHS had classified 66 per cent of these as approved and the other one-third as either "provisionally approved" or "no current report," said the PHS Bureau of Water Hygiene.

Testing of these water supplies is done by local, State and Federal agencies—in various cases by one, two or all three. The test is not conducted just at the point of use by an interstate carrier, but at random places in town.

MUNICIPAL OR PRIVATE WATER SUPPLIES USED BY INTERSTATE CARRIERS AND CLASSIFIED AS PROVISIONALLY APPROVED AS OF JULY 28, 1969

This table lists communities with water supplies provisionally approved for drinking and cooking on interstate carriers as of July 28, 1969. This classification means the supplies do not meet all Public Health Service standards. It is made by agreement between State officials and officials of the Bureau of Water Hygiene, Environmental Control Administration, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

To be classified "provisionally approved" does not mean the community's water supply is unsafe. Airplanes, ships, trains and buses are permitted to use provisionally approved water. Provisional classification, however, is a warning to State and local officials that deficiencies in a water supply system's construction, maintenance, operation or quality control must be corrected if certification as an interstate carrier water supplier is to be retained. The schedule for making improvements is individually determined for each water supply by the State Health Departments and the Bureau of Water Hygiene.

Alabama: Birmingham and Tuscaloosa.
Alaska: Kodiak; and Nome; and Umnak Island (Reeves Aleutian Airways).
Colorado: Grand Junction; Pueblo; and Salda.

Florida: Fort Myers; Freeport (Murphy Oil Company); and Miami Beach.

Georgia: Augusta; Augusta (Bush Field); Brunswick; Columbus; Macon; Savannah (National Gypsum Company); and Waycross.
Idaho: Lewiston Orchards Irrigation District.

Illinois: Beardstown; Bedford Park (Chicago Supply); Franklin Park (Chicago Supply); Hartford; Lemont (Pure Oil Company); and Rosemont.

Indiana: Mount Vernon.

Kentucky: Central City; and Fulton (Illinois Central Railroad).

Maine: Bucksport Water Company and Searsport.

Maryland: Brunswick.

Massachusetts: Fall River; Falmouth; New Bedford; Weymouth, and Worcester.

Mississippi: Moss Point.

Montana: Missoula.

Nebraska: McCook and North Platte.

Nevada: Carlin (Southern Pacific Railroad) and Las Vegas (Union Pacific Railroad).

New Hampshire: Portsmouth.

New Jersey: Bayonne (North Jersey District Water Supply Commission); Gloucester (Mobil Oil Company); Hoboken (Jersey City Water Supply); Jersey City; Kearny (North Jersey District Water Supply Commission); Lower Township Water Company, Newark; North Jersey District Water Supply Commission (Wanaque); Perth Amboy; Wrightstown (Fort Dix).

New York: Buffalo; New York; Onondaga County Water Authority; Oswego; Rome, and White Plains.

North Carolina: Asheville.

Ohio: Akron-Canton Airport; Toledo Airport; Wellsville.

Pennsylvania: Altoona; Clairton; Connellsville; Dravosburg; Fairless Hills (U.S. Steel Corporation); Floreffe.

Puerto Rico: Aquadilla; Mayaguez; San Juan.

Rhode Island: East Providence.

South Carolina: Cainho (Detyens Dry Dock); Charleston.

Tennessee: Alcoa; Chattanooga; Clarksburg; Johnson City; Kingsport (Washington-Sullivan Counties Consolidated Utilities District); Memphis and Nashville.

Texas: Brownsville (Brownsville Navigation District).

Virgin Islands: St. Croix (Alexander Hamilton Airport).

Virginia: Charlottesville; Crewe; Hot Springs (Virginia Hot Springs Co.); Norfolk, and Portsmouth.

Utah: Ogden, Salt Lake City, South Salt Lake City.

Washington: Bellingham; Edmonds; Everett; Hoquiam; Raymond; Wishram (Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railroad).

West Virginia: Charleston; Grafton; Parkersburg (Wood County Airport); Point Pleasant; and White Sulphur Springs.

Wisconsin: La Crosse; Manitowoc.

Wyoming: Green River; Rock Springs; Sheridan.

ATTENTION ALL AMERICANS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, deserving of the attention of all Americans who would stay free, are the profound remarks of Edmund Burke on "Freedom." While for many it takes years to comprehend the full sweep of Burke's exposition, its contents should be required reading for every citizen in or out of school:

EDMUND BURKE ON FREEDOM

Men are qualified for civil liberty in exact proportion to their disposition to put chains upon their own appetites; in proportion as their love of justice is above their rapacity; in proportion as their soundness and sobriety of understanding is above their vanity and presumption; in proportion as they are more disposed to listen to the counsels of the wise and good, in preference to the flattery of knaves. Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon the will and appetite is placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be of it without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate habits cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters.

A TRIBUTE TO TODAY'S YOUTH

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a notable task accomplished by the incoming seniors at Cambridge High School in Dorchester County. Six students took it upon themselves to initiate a clean-up of the high school that utilized 100 gallons of paint and would have cost the taxpayers \$5,000.

At a time when school vandalism and delinquency are on the increase and the newspapers are filled with the problems of youth it is good to see what our young people are doing who are not making headlines. The students of Cambridge deserve congratulations and respect for the fine job they have done and example they have set.

An article appeared in the Baltimore Sun magazine on Sunday, August 31, by Walter E. Huelle. The article tells the story of Cambridge High School and I am pleased to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CLEAN-UP BY THE CLASS OF 1970

When Otis M. Trice, principal of Cambridge High School, told James Busick, Dorchester county school superintendent, that six representatives of the class of 1970 wanted to see him, he reluctantly agreed.

This was in June, his busiest time of year, and when he was told by three girls and three boys that class members were volunteering to scrub and paint the interior of the high school during the summer he asked, "Why?"

The group representing the incoming seniors said their class wanted to improve the school's image. They proposed to do this by literally scrubbing away the black marks and graffiti left behind by the class of '69 and those before it.

The six also indicated that by setting a good example they hoped to erase other bad memories. They were referring to numerous rumbles after athletic contests and a beer party that was raided by police. The fact that three members of the class of '69 were sent to jail for stealing dynamite and blowing up a county road as the climax to other escapades undoubtedly was a factor too.

A permanent mark was left by last year's class on the masonry columns at the school's entrance. The numerals "69" were painted on five of six pillars and the columns were scarred in the cleaning process.

After listening to all these reasons, spoken or implied, by the six students, the superintendent said bluntly, "I don't believe you'll do it."

One of the girls, Karyn Cook, a top scholar and president of the Lower Eastern Shore Student Council, returned Mr. Busick's challenging look and replied firmly, "We'll do it."

The superintendent glanced at the others, Debbie Jenkins, president of the Student Council; Bob McWilliams and Steve Aarons, varsity athletes; Karan Woodward, John Wharple and was convinced that this was no ordinary request and promise.

After the principal got approval from the board of education to buy paint and brushes, the students started to work the last week in June.

On the first of August, 30 members of the class of 1970 were still scrubbing and painting. And although it was an unusually hot and humid Eastern Shore summer, with both temperatures and humidity in the 90's even

at night, the boys and girls painted three nights a week from 7:15 to 10, singing a good part of the time.

Most of the student painters have summer jobs. Some girls work as clerks in stores or are waitresses in restaurants and lunch-rooms. Some, after finishing the nearly three-hour painting stint, work in snack bars that stay open late. And a number had parts in the Dorchester County Tercentenary show that ran five nights in July after rehearsing for a month.

Early in the project a freshly painted area was mysteriously marred by vandals. The damage was shown to Mr. Busick, but the boys begged him not to take action. "We'll handle this ourselves," they said.

Before the project started and the word got around that the class was going to paint, the numerals '70 were scratched on several school walls. Apparently the scribbles were mocking the altruism of the incoming senior class. One unnerving omen, however, was the appearance of the numerals '72 on one of the walls.

William Kahl, school custodian, is on hand during the painting sessions; school officials drop in from time to time. These include John Armstrong who is in charge of plant and buildings. He says the students, who have used 100 gallons of paint and performed about \$5,000 worth of labor, are doing a top-grade job and saving the taxpayers money.

Acts of vandalism at Cambridge High had been increasing steadily. They reached a peak last year. This parallels a national trend.

School vandalism caused damage in the United States amounting to \$200 million in 1967-1968. It costs Baltimore \$716,602 and New York City \$5 million.

Breaking schoolhouse windows is one of the biggest forms of vandalism. The Cambridge High custodian has replaced one steel framed louvered window four times, at \$10 a pane.

Another form of student vandalism is stuffing chewing gum into the keyholes of door locks. The custodian at Cambridge High says students also jam small nails or bobby pins into the keyholes. Throwing soda bottles into toilet bowls hard enough to break is another form of youthful aberration. Prying locker doors open and pilfering them is also common.

A nationwide survey shows New York city's school glass breakage bill in 1968 was a million dollars, Philadelphia's \$684,000 and Baltimore's \$356,602. Among Maryland's 23 counties, Baltimore county spent \$65,000 replacing broken windows, Hartford \$11,810 and Washington \$407. Dorchester's net cost for glass, above what insurance companies have paid and parents of caught culprits have been assessed, was \$40 last year.

Although the net cost of damage to Dorchester's 26 school buildings last year was \$275, claims for vandalism paid by insurance companies and reparations by parents amounted to much more.

On the basis of net damage reported in a survey made by Baltimore public schools to which 13 of the 23 Maryland counties responded, Dorchester had the lowest per capita damage—4 cents. Talbot county's bill for damages, with 2,000 fewer pupils, was 8 cents. Baltimore city's was \$3.74.

To reduce school vandalism throughout the nation stringent methods are being employed. They include the use of unbreakable, plastic windows, floodlights on school grounds and electric alarm systems. Some schools have hired guards, many of them armed and patrolling with police dogs. Dorchester schools are using night watchmen. The Cambridge High School custodian lives on the premises.

Dorchester school officials, however, are hoping that the example set by the class of 1970 in declaring its sense of responsibility toward public property and student behavior will upset the grave, upward trend of school vandalism and misconduct.

A UNIQUE INSIGHT INTO LATIN AMERICAN PROBLEMS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Saturday Review carried a most perceptive and timely article by Sol M. Linowitz entitled "Tinderbox in Latin America." Mr. Linowitz, who until recently was the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, has a unique insight into the problems of our Latin American neighbors, informed by years of intimate involvement with them. Especially at this time, when United States-Latin American relations are being closely reviewed in the Nixon administration, I think my colleagues will be most interested in Mr. Linowitz' comments.

I especially want to call attention to his statement that—

What it all boils down to is that we cannot help Latin America solve its economic problems with bargain-basement tactics. We cannot do it on the cheap. Rhetoric is fine in its place, and the ringing words of our regard for Latin America make for fine speeches. But without the financial commitment to back up the words we are in trouble in this hemisphere, and we had better make no mistake about it.

I cannot commend these sentiments too strongly and under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I submit Mr. Linowitz' article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TINDERBOX IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Sol M. Linowitz¹)

For some time now it has become a tired Washington cliché to issue periodic pronouncements to the effect that United States relations with Latin America are in a state of crisis and we must, finally, do something about it. It would be difficult to find anyone, no matter how sparse his knowledge of the hemisphere, who would argue about the crisis half of the cliché. It is the latter part—"do something about it"—that causes all the trouble.

James Reston once observed that the American people will do anything for Latin America except read about it. The apathy is so widespread and endemic, however, that the usually reliable Mr. Reston may have overstated the case with regard to the American people's willingness to do anything for their hemispheric neighbors.

There is a paradox about the situation that contributes to making it one of the most perplexing among the many foreign policy problems that periodically plague Washington administrations, no matter what their political gender. Beginning with Franklin Roosevelt and his Good Neighbor Policy through John Kennedy and the Alliance for Progress, Lyndon Johnson and the summit meeting of American presidents, and now Richard Nixon and the Rockefeller Latin American study mission, no President, Democratic or Republican, in nearly two generations has denied the importance of Latin America, or has claimed it can be neglected or ignored.

Yet despite all the programs and official avowals of concern, who can find any sense

of excitement about Latin America among the people of the United States? That does not mean we do not get worked up over a Castro, a Cuban missile crisis, a Dominican Republic crisis, an oil company expropriation, a fishing boat seizure. Or that we are not shocked when the visit of a Governor Rockefeller, who is rightly regarded as a friend of Latin America, touches off nasty demonstrations.

That is the heart of the paradox for the emotions are genuine and the concern is real. Yet when the crisis of the moment is over emotion subsides and concern is shrugged off and once again we turn our attention to another part of the world—until some new Latin explosion such as the El Salvador-Honduran clash reluctantly drags it back again to our own hemisphere.

To suggest that this lack of public interest is directly responsible for the state of affairs in Latin America would be less than accurate. Surely it is not responsible for the nagging economic underdevelopment that grips the continent and its 240 million people—240 million who will be 600 million before the century is out and if circumstances continue as they are, many times poorer.

The other side of the coin, however, is that our public disinterest sharply points up the inescapable fact that there is no real Latin American constituency in the United States—a political nuance that the Congress has not failed to notice.

Last year, for example, we disappointed the people of Latin America with cuts in our appropriation for the Alliance for Progress—cuts that made it the lowest since that vital program was launched in 1961: \$336-million against some \$500-million in 1966 and \$460-million the following year. This year President Nixon has proposed an appropriation of \$603-million, and already we are beginning to hear the sound of chopping on Capitol Hill.

Obviously, it is far from the intent of Congress to do anything that would slow the rhythm of development in Latin America, for that could only weaken the constructive forces of peaceful change and give impetus to those who believe in violence as the way to alter the status quo. But cutting our share of the alliance appropriation has this precise effect, whether that is the intent or not, and the United States cannot evade responsibility.

What it all boils down to is that we cannot help Latin America solve its economic problems with bargain-basement tactics. We cannot do it on the cheap. Rhetoric is fine in its place, and the ringing words of our regard for Latin America make for fine speeches. But without the financial commitment to back up the words we are in trouble in this hemisphere, and we had better make no mistake about it.

Too often in our relations with Latin America over the years we in the United States have not done as we said, nor have we always said clearly just what it is we would do. Our promises, moreover, have not always withstood the test of time or pressure. The people of Latin America have good reason to be confused about how seriously we regard them and their problems and, based on past experience, even better reason to have skepticism with regard to the credibility and continuity of the commitments we make to them.

There should be no doubt that this uncertainty in Latin America is a contributory factor in the repeated demonstrations of anti-U.S. sentiments that crop up with disturbing frequency, or that it is a potent weapon in the hands of those who relish the notion of a fragmented Western Hemisphere, with the South being played off against the North. Nor can there be any question that the time is long past for Washington to undertake a credible commitment to the republics of Latin America that will resolve

¹ Sol M. Linowitz, former United States Ambassador to the Organization of American States, is presently practicing law in New York and Washington, D.C.

the doubts that now give rise to such uncertainty and even to fear.

President Johnson, following the summit meeting of American presidents at Punta del Este in 1967, went a long way toward extending such a commitment when he said, "We will persevere. There is no time limit on our commitment." But realistically speaking, the words he spoke did not have the force of law or of a treaty—a fact Congress made all the more evident when it cut the alliance funds last year. And with a change of Administration, accompanied by all the uncertainty that such a change brings with it, the Latins are still wondering how far we will go, and to what extent we will persevere.

It was not, I am sure, President Nixon's intent to add to this uncertainty when, a few months after taking office, he addressed the Organization of American States and strongly criticized the alliance for all that it had left undone. Even the dispatch of Governor Rockefeller on his fact-finding mission, rather than help assuage fears that Washington was contemplating a major change in its Latin American policy, only intensified the uncomfortable feeling that, once again, things were up in the air.

Inevitably, there will be much of value in what Governor Rockefeller will be reporting to the President, but the point cannot be overstressed that we need, above all, patience, perspective, and the determination to see the job through. Latin America should not be an issue for domestic party politics. Quite the contrary, it offers what is perhaps the most inviting area for constructive and imaginative bipartisan foreign policy cooperation.

It is the kind of cooperation that must look beyond the immediate horizon and focus on another far off, one still shrouded in clouds of uncertainty. For no matter what we do, no matter how firm our commitments, no matter what funds we appropriate to help the people of Latin America to build and to develop their continent, no matter what our trade policies, we cannot guarantee the future; we cannot say that if we do this Latin America will be an unwavering ally and firm friend of the United States, that it will offer us a vast commercial market for our goods. No one—politician, economist, or seer—can offer any such guarantee. And even if he could, it would be a poor motivation for the kind of effort that must be undertaken for the remainder of this century.

Latin America is not for sale to the highest bidder, and if we gear our programs with the idea that it is, we are in for a sad awakening—an awakening that, as recent events demonstrate, has already begun. What we must understand is that change in Latin America is inevitable. The only question remaining is whether it is to be a violent change or a relatively peaceful one, and obviously, therefore, our own best interests would dictate that we aid those forces seeking to build and to strengthen economic and political democracy in Latin America.

If they should fail, the change that is bound to follow can only be one of violence. All the explosive ingredients are present. For in Latin America, even as in the United States, we cannot expect people denied hope and dignity to sit patiently while life and the world pass them by.

The point has been made that if Latin American governments do not pass badly needed economic and social reforms they deserve to fall. And it has been argued too that perhaps some violence may be necessary to convince the oligarchies and military governments that desperate conditions beget desperate actions. To some extent it is difficult to answer those arguments. It is all too true that in too many cases Latin governments are not doing all they should and all they could to cope with the underlying causes of economic and social underdevelopment, nor are they doing enough of what must be

done to promote the growth of representative government responsive to the will of the people. These facts are all too glaring to be swept under the rug, and we should recognize them for what they are—part of the reality of Latin America today.

What all this points up is the truism evident wherever people are struggling to be free—economically, socially, and politically: Time is not on the side of those who would shelter the status quo. Those who would see democracy and freedom fulfill their destiny have the responsibility of seeing to it that the vicious circle of poverty, sickness, and illiteracy is broken once and for all. People within its orbit live outside the mainstream of society and really play no part in shaping their nation's policies; because they are not part of the democratic process, they have little stake in it.

Clearly we must do all we can to encourage the growth of orderly, democratic procedures sensitive to the needs of the people they are designed to serve. But we can not and must not elbow our way into another country's system, telling it how it should manage its affairs, as if we had all the answers. We haven't, as the problems before us of putting our own house in order aptly testify.

What we can do, however—and what we have not done with any real consistency—is to make clear our firm commitment to representative government and to the growth of political democracy in this hemisphere. Such a policy will enable us to develop special friendships with Latin America's men of vision, with the men who know that peaceful social progress is endangered by any entrenchment of the privileged few.

Today the despair that exists in much of Latin America provides the climate in which a Batista or a Castro flourishes best, or in which a despotism of the right can provide the foundation for a dictatorship of the left. Or vice versa. It is a situation that only underscores the urgency of continuing the partnership launched eight years ago this month when President Kennedy, following a Latin-inspired initiative known as "Operation Pan-America," pledged the support of the United States to the Alliance for Progress.

The alliance was a magnificent concept, with goals and aspirations to match its grandeur. If it can be faulted in hindsight, it would be for assuming that the job could be done in ten years. That, and setting an annual growth-rate goal without recognizing that the birth rate was shooting up at a pace that far exceeded Latin America's growth-rate capabilities.

But who can argue that any program of the scope and reach of the alliance—a program designed to bring about the upheaval of the Latin American continent and build a healthy, vibrant, economically secure, and politically sound inter-American community—must not set its sights high, and that it must not keep them there? Surely not the people who live without amenities of civilization, or without hope of a better tomorrow. For they can attain that tomorrow only if there is no compromise in the fight to attain the goals the alliance so eloquently set forth—goals for better housing, education, health, tax and land reforms, a revitalized and modernized industry and agriculture, and an integrated continent-wide economy.

Yet the yearly per capita growth rate still is well behind the Punta del Este goal of 2.5 per cent. The birth rate soars. Fifty per cent of the people are illiterate. The cities are clogged with workless *campesinos*. Tight protective tariffs protect inefficient monopolies. Feudalism persists in the countryside, and the people there go hungry or move away.

If it was a mistake then to hope that this could be changed in ten years, it would be catastrophic now to turn our backs on what

has been done. True, economic sufficiency remains a distant goal, but for the first time a way has been charted out of the Latin American jungle of underdevelopment.

The statistics add up to an impressive total, particularly in an area of the world that has never experienced such concentrated doses of progress. But no statistic can possibly convey the meaning of a new road that slices through an Amazon jungle and links up a hitherto isolated village with the heartland of its country. Nor can it convey the significance of a new classroom opened for children in the plateaus of the Andes or in the *barrios* of the cities; of a *campesino* who now works his own farm; of water supplies made potable; of infant mortality rates reduced; of a family able to quit the sordid life of the slums for a new start in a new apartment.

And with all the statistics totaled up, it is clear that the alliance has devoted more of its resources to investments in the social areas, particularly education and health services, than in any other sector.

The actual rate of Latin American development, therefore, is higher than the economic growth charts indicate simply because social investment is not reflected in Latin America's gross product. But the direct effort to speed up the processes of education and social welfare is the surest guarantee that an obsolete social order will be peacefully transformed, as in Japan or Britain, rather than explosively altered via the violent, revolutionary routes of eighteenth-century France or twentieth-century Russia.

What must be understood above all about the alliance—and perhaps the most misunderstood feature, even among a number of our own key government officials—is that it is not a bilateral American aid program, but rather a cooperative self-help program, to be carried out primarily by the people of Latin America. The United States is one partner in this program, of which 90 per cent is financed by the countries of Latin America. The alliance is not ours to manipulate, and the amount we appropriate, therefore, is no handout, but a hand of help extended in friendship. Congress must not forget this when considering how much we can afford to appropriate for our share of the effort.

When all is said and done, and with all that remains undone, there is no escape from the conclusion that eight years ago the alliance launched a truly creative, regenerative development program. But it was, and is, only the first step in a long journey. In our inter-American relations, we need most of all a sense of propriety, a sense of time, a sense of scale, and a sense of destiny.

As for propriety, Americans may find wry amusement in cartoons that depict the stereotyped Latin American—the sleepy, guitar-playing, sombrero-wearing, not too ambitious but pleasant fellow. But the stereotyped North American—the Yankee with the dollar sign for a heart—is hardly the object for smiles in Latin America. The truth, of course, is that neither stereotype is valid today, if it ever was.

The people of Latin America are a combination of some of the wealthiest cultures our civilization has known. Its young people, with their passion for country and their zeal for the future, are restless and prone to impatience. They are skeptical of our aims and so are more willing to blame us for their problems than to understand the difficulties in solving them. Yet these are the people with the mystique and the vision of grandeur who can spark the enthusiasm and loyalties of their countrymen. These are the people who are so anxiously searching for a revolution of social justice—the very people we must convince that we want to work with them because our continued partnership is essential to the future of freedom. In so doing, anti-Communism as such will not get

us very far. It is not a powerful argument for the average citizen who is steeped in a personal struggle to keep his head above water.

A student at the University of Chile once summed it up when he told me: "The United States is constantly talking about the value of political democracy. We agree that it is essential, but we also feel you would accomplish far more if you said less about political democracy and put more of your weight behind the concept of economic democracy."

What he was saying is that city slum dwellers denied hope and illiterate rural Indians denied even a glimpse of the twentieth century neither comprehend the meaning of political democracy nor offer any foundation to sustain or to nurture it. They will either remain mute or give their sullen support to the demagogue or "leader" who elbows his way through the masses offering them protection and food. These are the staple commodities they want and need, and no promise of a better life made possible by democracy can vie with them. As former Senator Paul Douglas once said, "When you offer a starving man a choice between the Four Freedoms and four sandwiches, he always chooses the four sandwiches."

When, however, attention is given to questions of basic order, when roads and streets are made safe, when food, clothing, and shelter are made available, when attention is given to living conditions, when the masses discover they can rear, educate, and marry off their children and leave them an opportunity for a better life, political democracy becomes not only possible, but imperative. For as living standards rise, democracy becomes the only political system through which that better life can be sustained and advanced. And this is to the mutual benefit of all the Americas.

As for time, no nation has fully modernized itself in less than sixty years. The United States took much longer. In eight years Latin America, despite false starts and frustrated hopes, has made more progress than we had any right to expect. Realistically, however, it would be unwise to think in terms of less than thirty years for full-scale modernization of the continent. After eight years the alliance must, therefore, be regarded as in its infancy. Any other view does injustice to Latin America.

And this leads to the need for a sense of scale in our relations with Latin Americans, including a sense of proportion in both the United States and Latin America. We must look at our hemisphere with a new eye of understanding, one that recognizes its importance to the future peace of the world. We cannot take Latin America for granted, believing it will be there when we need it. We need it now no less—and perhaps more—than it needs us, for what happens there in the closing years of this century may well shape the coming years of the next century.

As for Latin Americans, it is time for them to recognize that the United States is not the wielder of the big stick of the 1900s, that we mean what we say about wanting to work with them, that our commitment is to an inter-American community of equal states. In short, they must turn away from memories of the past and turn instead to our mutual hopes for the future.

We talk of destiny, of partnership, of shared hopes and efforts toward hemispheric unity. But what does that destiny look like if our hemisphere ends up half suburb and half slum? Is this the limit we set to the creative, working partnership the American presidents established at Punta del Este to meet the increasing needs of today's "revolution of rising expectations"?

Surely our destiny is more in keeping with the brave new world we have always sought to build. Surely it is more in keeping with our faith that the dream of Simón Bolívar will flourish at last, like the dreams of our

own founding fathers—that this hemisphere will grow in prosperity and confidence into a model of how states, with all their diversity of cultures and differences of gifts, can work together to improve and enrich and ennoble their common life.

We shall not do this with cold, lifeless graphs and charts. We shall not do this with Congressional cuts. We shall not do this between today and tomorrow. But with time and with resources, and with the republics of the Americas all working together, it can be done.

SOMETHING TO REMEMBER US BY

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting in my congressional district during the recess, at a gathering which I had been invited to address, an introduction was prepared by one of the members of the organization. He presents in rhyme a comprehensive catalog of questions and issues which are on the minds of the folks at home. Under leave to extend by remarks in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD, I would like to include this poetic quiz for the information of my colleagues in the House. The poem follows:

SOMETHING TO REMEMBER US BY

(By Bob Compton)

Even though we may only see you once a year.

It's a real pleasure, Del, to have you here.

We look forward to your legislative report;
The bills you oppose and the bills you support.

On national government you keep us up to date,

It is sort of a preview of our fate.

But please excuse us if we don't seem like scholars;

Our minds aren't geared to billions of dollars.

Tell us what's new on the Washington scene;

The ins and outs of the political machine.

What progress was made in sixty-nine?

In nineteen seventy can we hold the line?

Will we have pulled out of Vietnam,

Or will we employ a nuclear bomb?

Is Russia now considered friend or foe?

What can we expect from Chi Minh Ho?

(Poetic license)

What is your opinion of medicare?

Will schools be entitled to hear a prayer?

Now that we've landed on the moon,

Is Mars next or is it much too soon?

Is President Nixon on his way to fame?

By the way, what's the Vice President's name?

Are we concerned that they devalued the franc?

For higher taxes who do we thank?

Is there any money in the Social Security till?

Do you feel that Ted Kennedy is over the hill?

Will the United Nations get the sack,

Or be saved by Shirley Temple Black?

How long will J. Edgar Hoover maintain his thunder?

Will the Supreme Court never cease to blunder?

Will the Dow Jones average continue to fall?

What is the answer to the West German wall?

Will adults under twenty one be allowed to vote?

What is the latest Jim Garrison quote?

What is your opinion of the Warren Report?

How many foreign countries do we support?

What's going to happen to postal rates?

What are you doing about conglomerates?

Will violence and riots rock our land?

Is our welfare program out of hand?

Will the prime rate be going up or down?

Can urban renewal help our town?

How can dope peddling be turned away?

Are hippies really here to stay?

Can you board a plane for Savannah, without fear of ending up in Havana?

How can auto traffic be abated?

Will all our schools be integrated?

Are we beginning to feel a slight recession or is that a nice word for depression?

Will teachers teach or join the insurrection?

Can those who need it get protection?

Does President Nixon also have a dog?

What are you doing to eliminate smog?

Will unions continue to have such power?

Are they going to tear down the Eiffel Tower?

What is the size of our national debt?

Is there any way it can ever be met?

What are you doing about over population?

How are you going to stop inflation?

How many crops will be plowed under?

How many flags will be torn asunder?

Will the Pueblo incident be repeated?

Is Korea again getting overheated?

Can the world expect famine or feast?

How explosive is the Middle East?

Will the cost of living continue to rise?

Can the Cosa Nostra be cut down to size?

Will the astronauts be allowed to pray?

Is oil depletion here to stay?

Is our news media giving us factual data,

or are flying saucers from another strata?

Is the Truth in Lending a committee's notion,

or a product of some witch's potion?

These points we hope can be clarified; which

are but rumors, which are verified?

So give us the facts, Del, not just fiction,

you're not the type to use restriction.

But setting aside these problems if we may,

We have a special wish for you today.

To us this is a meaningful date, and we

would like to help you celebrate—

Your birthday and we don't care which one.

We just want to wish you health and fun.

Come back next year, older but wiser too,

with this schedule of things we've given you.

Of course if you've solved the problems by

that time,

We'll find another way to end the rhyme.

But if you haven't, then please believe us,

Del,

Like true constituents, we'll give you hell!

ERNEST PETINAUD HONORED

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, it has recently been brought to my attention that our distinguished friend—Mr. Ernest S. Petinaud—was the recipient of a great honor. He has been recommended by the imperial potentate of the Ancient Egyptian Arabic Order, Nobles Mystic Shrine of North and South America and its Jurisdictions, Inc., for the degree of honorary past imperial potentate. Ernie will receive this honor at the Imperial

Council Convention and sessions to be held in Boston next August.

Ernie's presence in the halls of the Capitol has become part of this building's tradition. His abilities, recognized by all of us here in the House, are far exceeded by his warmth as a man.

I was pleased to learn of this award to Ernie and I am sure all of my colleagues join me in congratulating a great American—Ernest S. Petinaud.

NIXON BACKS UP ON TAX EQUITY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the Washington Post, Sunday, September 7, 1969, by Hobart Rowen entitled, "Nixon Backs Up on Tax Equity." The article is an excellent analysis of the way the administration has broken its promise to the American public.

As Mr. Rowen points out the Nixon "tax reform" proposals are a clear indication that "lobbyists for Wall Street, the Nation's corporate hierarchy, have all earned a good raise." "And lobbyists for average-income persons apparently are nonexistent."

The Nixon proposals remove \$2.5 billion of tax relief from the middle income Americans—the forgotten Americans—and gives \$1.6 billion to business.

The articles continues:

In reality, the rate reduction (for business) will amount to much more than the \$1.6 billion cited by the Treasury, which does not take into account the probable growth of the economy.

Said one expert:

There's no discernible philosophy in the Treasury bill. They didn't move in the first place until the Ways and Means Committee built a fire under them. Now, they still seem to be reacting instead of providing the kind of leadership you expect from a Department of the Treasury.

Mr. Rowen's analysis is as follows:

NIXON BACKS UP ON TAX EQUITY

(By Hobart Rowen)

Lobbyists for Wall Street, the nation's corporate hierarchy, the big foundations and the educational establishments have all earned a good raise.

Those working for the oil industry have earned their pay, but no salary boosts.

Lobbyists representing real estate interests have probably lost their jobs.

And lobbyists for average-income persons apparently are nonexistent.

These are the conclusions being drawn by sophisticated tax experts in the nation's capital, examining the Nixon Administration's reform recommendations. Their general conclusion is that the administration has taken a distinct step backward, over all, from a halting effort toward tax equity in the House Ways and Means Committee bill.

"The Nixon administration has been willing to bend where it has been pushed," said one tax lawyer yesterday.

As analyzed here, the Treasury's most serious rejection of the principle of tax equality

is in its recommended changes in the capital gains area.

The House bill had contained a modest proposal, increasing the holding period for long-term capital gains to one year from six months, and eliminating the existing 25 per cent tax ceiling. It did nothing to tackle the problem of gains that escape taxation at death.

In fact, out of an estimated \$8.5 billion annually lost by the Treasury through the capital gains preference rules, the House was going to pick up only \$635 million.

But instead of approving the House provision as a good initial step to be followed by further plugging of the capital gains loophole, the Treasury went the other way. It recommended keeping the six-month definition of long-term gains, and except for some special circumstances, proposed keeping the 25 per cent maximum tax limit on capital gains. Loss, compared with the House bill: \$210 million. Score a big one for the Wall Street lobby, which sold Treasury on the idea that "capital investments would tend to be frozen" by the House provisions.

On top of this, Mr. Nixon introduced something brand new: a tax reduction of two points in the corporate rate that would cost \$1.6 billion a year. This gives back to business about half of the money taken away through repeal of the investment tax credit. (In reality, the rate reduction will amount to much more than the \$1.6 billion cited by the Treasury, which does not take into account the probable growth of the economy. None of the estimates for any of the bill's gains or losses takes economic growth into consideration. Over-all revenue losses will tend to be much larger than those cited officially). Score the corporate rate cut for Big Business lobbyists.

In terms of individuals, the Treasury proposed changes that it claims would concentrate tax reform benefits in the lowest income brackets. But there is some dispute among the experts on just how the Treasury plan would actually compare with the House proposal in the lower brackets. It is clear, however, that the Treasury proposal would shift tax relief within the middle-income brackets. It would tend to diminish the advantages given home owners in the House bill, by reducing the standard deduction ceiling to \$1,400 instead of \$2,000 as in the House bill. The Treasury would also repeal the personal deduction now allowed for state gasoline taxes (a \$10 or \$15 item for most taxpayers). Over all, the Treasury would trim back individual tax relief by \$2.5 billion, compared with the House bill. Score card: consumer tax lobby needed.

On the delicate issue of taxation of interest on bonds issued by state and local governments (now free), the Nixon Administration retreated completely. The House would have included this tax-free interest in the calculation of a 50 per cent minimum tax. But the Treasury would allow individuals to continue to accumulate huge amounts of wealth, tax-free, by this loophole. Worst of all, the Treasury hid behind the notion of the "constitutionality" of taxing municipal bond interest, a question that the legal fraternity agrees was put to rest more than 25 years ago. Chalk the victory for this one up to the Mayors' lobby and Vice President Agnew.

Perhaps the most complicated area of tax reform proposals relates to the oil industry, and here the administration went further than expected in some areas—but responded to oil industry pressures in others.

It went along with the House recommendation for reducing the depletion allowance from 27.5 per cent to 20 per cent. Moreover, it proposed including excess depletion in the minimum tax calculation, as well as in the Allocation of Deductions Rules.

But the Treasury supported a version of a

special provision (intangible drilling costs) that permits oil operators to deduct exploration costs in the year paid out, rather than spreading such costs (really capital outlays) over a period of years as is required in other industries.

The Treasury would make it tougher for those not primarily engaged in the oil business to profit from the very specialized set of provisions. But tax lawyers say that anyone in the oil business will still be able to write-off much, possibly all of his income against allowable intangible drilling costs. Score a halfway victory for the oil lobby.

The real estate lobby, which has been riding high, wide and handsome for years, profiting from accelerated amortization provisions, was hit hard by the House bill, which removes special double depreciation provisions (except for new housing). The Treasury goes even farther by adding to both the LTP (minimum tax) and the allocation of deduction rule (ADR) provisions the excess of interest, taxes, and rent from unimproved property during the period of construction. It also would reach out and grab under LTP and ADR accelerated depreciation on leased personal property (this latter would affect such things as bank lease-backs of aircraft to airlines. Scoreboard: new lobbyists needed by the real estate crowd).

The foundations and the universities did well. Instead of facing a 7½ per cent tax, the foundations would be clipped by the Treasury only for a 2 per cent "supervisory" tax.

This tax would be kept out of general revenues, and be related, at least in theory, to Internal Revenue's administrative costs. If the idea is accepted, it would rule out in a practical sense any big future boosts in the tax rate on foundation income. The universities and other institutions got theirs by persuading the Treasury to back a softened provision on taxation on the increased value of gifts to such institutions. Score a plus for the egg-head type lobbyist.

The Treasury was alternately tough and weak in many other areas too numerous to detail. For example, it improved on the House's farm "lobby" loss provision, but for no accountable reason, it caved in on closing a co-operative tax loophole.

It held firm on the House proposal to make "restricted stock plans" for executives less attractive, but waffled on the question of deferred compensation. The House suggested a minimum tax on deferred compensation payments exceeding \$10,000. The Treasury argues for deletion of this provision pending a study of the tax treatment of all deferred compensation, including amounts paid under profit-sharing and pension plans.

"There's no discernible philosophy in the Treasury bill," said one expert. "They didn't move in the first place until the Ways and Means Committee built a fire under them. Now, they still seem to be reacting instead of providing the kind of leadership you expect from a Department of the Treasury."

PRESIDENT NIXON REITERATES SUPPORT OF POSTAL REFORM

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon on September 2 reiterated his support of postal reform, stressing the importance of its early passage.

President Nixon stated that the setting up of a Government corporation to re-

place the present system is one of the top priority measures of his administration.

I am indeed proud to have introduced the administration's postal reform bill. I believe, as does the President, that it will provide what this country deserves—fast, efficient, postal service.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the President's remarks of September 2 and those of Postmaster General Winton M. Blount, the Honorable Lawrence F. O'Brien, and the Honorable Thruston Morton in a press conference which followed:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT ON POSTAL REFORM

Ladies and Gentlemen: I am flanked today by a bipartisan group which is gathered together for what I consider to be one of the top priority measures of this Administration.

Several months ago you will recall my meeting with the press in Washington, along with Postmaster General Blount, and indicating the complete support of this Administration for postal reform, the setting up of a Government corporation in place of the present system.

Within the next two weeks a major decision will be made in the House of Representatives by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with regard to the bill which will be reported to the House. This will be the first round in a very big battle as to whether we are to continue a system which has proved that it is inefficient, inadequate to meet the tremendous responsibilities that we have today, or whether we are to have a new system that will give this country what it deserves—fast, efficient postal service.

This is a bipartisan measure, bipartisan in the sense that it was first recommended by President Johnson, and as indicated today, it is supported not only by the Administration and the Postmaster General, but by two former Chairmen of the National Committees, the former Democratic National Chairman, Mr. O'Brien, and the former Republican National Chairman, Senator Morton.

Mr. O'Brien, I should say, has had the position Mr. Blount has as Postmaster General, and is enthusiastically for this legislation.

I simply want to say in conclusion, before they submit to your questions, that I believe that postal reform is high on the list of those items which I indicated in my speech last night needs a new approach, an approach that will be adequate to the Seventies.

Our present postal system is obsolete; it has broken down; it is not what it ought to be for a nation of 200 million people, and a nation that will be 300 million within 30 years, and now is the time to act. We are very happy to have the bipartisan support that we have, as indicated by this meeting this morning.

The Postmaster General will take over, and all three will answer questions—either on the post office or politically.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF POSTMASTER GENERAL WINTON M. BLOUNT, THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN, AND THE HONORABLE THRUSTON MORTON

Postmaster General BLOUNT. Ladies and Gentlemen: If you have any questions, we will be delighted to answer them.

Q. General Blount, where do you expect the opposition to come on the postal reorganization plan?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. There have been intensive hearings in the House during this summer. They have concluded those hearings. There was some opposition from the postal unions and some opposition on some of the other small parts of this legislation. But the legislation itself stood the test of the challenge in the committee hearings and

we are very optimistic that we are going to get this bill out of committee and passed this year.

Q. General Blount, on the political side of the proposal, now that the hearings have concluded in the House, can you gauge for us the amount of opposition you received because of the potential loss of political patronage.

Postmaster General BLOUNT. I don't really think that has been very significant. I think that when we introduced this legislation that it was generally said that we did not have three votes on the committee. We feel that it is also widely acknowledged at the present time that we have about an even split on the committee.

I think that represents a great deal of progress. I think, again, it represents the fact that this legislation has stood up under the challenge that the committee hearings have given it.

Q. Do you think it will come out pretty much intact the way the Administration recommends it?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. There may be some changes, but I hope not substantive changes.

Q. What do you regard as the most important reform that will take place?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. Well, I think the most important thing about this legislation is that it centralizes management in one place. Now we have a fragmented management. The Congress sets the basic policy decisions, the prices for postal service, and they set the cost in that 80 percent of our costs are wages.

So they, in fact, control some of the major policy decisions of this operation. They set the investment policy by how much we are able to invest in capital facilities and mechanization.

So this legislation centralizes these management decisions in the management of the Post Office Department and then for the first time you will be able to hold a Postmaster General responsible for managing this department.

Q. Is there much opposition in Congress to losing this power?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. I think, again, as I have stated on a number of occasions, that this is pretty comprehensive legislation. It is really the first time that you are talking about taking a Cabinet Department and removing it from Cabinet status.

We have 300 million customers. People should examine this legislation. The Congress should examine it. We have 750,000 employees who need to examine it. This is what has been going on since our legislation was introduced.

I think as I have said earlier, we have made great progress in talking to the Members of Congress about this legislation.

Q. What was the reason for the meeting today with the President?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. The principal reason for the meeting was to receive from Mr. O'Brien and Senator Morton a report on their activities of the Bipartisan Citizens Committee that is supporting this legislation. The President and I were both delighted to hear of the things that they have been doing and we have been working with them in trying to support this legislation.

Q. What did you tell the President, Mr. O'Brien?

Mr. O'Brien. In general terms, the Senator and I reported to the President that we felt some significant progress was being made toward this legislation. Now we all realize it takes sometimes, an inordinate period of time to legislate in important areas.

But from the time that I first made the suggestion and the Kappel Commission reported, I think that the education program that we are engaged in has been beneficial. I can't recall a similar situation—I tried to

think back over a number of years—where you have President's from the opposite parties and party officials from both parties united in a common cause.

You will recall that President Johnson supports this legislation and President Nixon, of course, has proposed it in his message. Postmaster General Blount has been carrying the ball on the Hill for it and we have been trying, as citizens of this nation, for the continuing interest in this area, to do what we can to be helpful.

Q. Mr. Blount, is the opposition from the postal union because of fear of job loss or loss of seniority, is that the basis?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. I think the basis for most of the opposition, really, is that this is change. Everybody in dealing with change has some reluctance to come to grips with it. I think that the postal unions have been very diligent in their efforts to understand this legislation. I have personally had a number of meetings with them to talk about it. I hope that they will ultimately come to the position of supporting this legislation.

Q. What is the deficit—predicted deficit—for the current fiscal year, and if this legislation is not enacted, what would be the perspective deficit for fiscal 1971?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. The perspective deficit is \$1.3 billion.

Q. That is this current year?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. That is right. Now, we don't think that this legislation is going to turn this department around overnight. It is going to take time. This is a department that has not had the opportunity to be managed for decades. So we provide in our legislation a transition period of five years for this corporation to break even.

Q. When will the next postal rate increase go into effect, in your opinion?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. Well, we proposed it four months ago and the Congress has not acted on it yet. That is one of the things about this legislation. We need to be more responsive to the conditions affecting the Post Office Department. I could not forecast when this would be enacted by the Congress.

Q. Are you still asking for a one cent increase in first class mail?

Postmaster General BLOUNT. That is right.

Q. Senator Morton, when General Blount first went forward with his idea of reorganization there were both public and anonymous statements of opposition in the Senate, rather strong statements, as General Blount probably recalls.

What can you tell us today about the chances of this bill in the Senate itself?

Senator MORTON. I would be more optimistic about the Senate than I would be about the House, frankly. I am optimistic about the House. The Senate has not had a word of hearing, nothing has been done. I have not attempted to nose count in the Senate. I have not discussed this with many Senators in detail.

The time I have spent on it I have been trying to work with the House, especially the House committee, giving my support, obviously, and my reasons for being for this.

Many years ago, longer than I care to remember, I served on that committee. There is only one person still on the Committee who was there at that time. But these are people on both sides of the aisle that I respect greatly.

Q. Will this bipartisan effort continue?

Mr. O'Brien. This bipartisan effort might continue forever.

Senator MORTON. This question of the Congress, I can speak to this question about the patronage that has been brought up here several times, as one who spent a good many years in the Congress. You are always going to give lip service to the postal organizations. They are right effective politically,

frankly. But most members of the Congress, down in their hearts, would like to get rid of this headache. Because, when you make a man postmaster in "Chittlin Switch" you lose ten family votes, and "Chittlin Switch" might not have but ten families.

The workers of the Post Office Department, I think 65 percent, retire in the jobs in which they started. After 30 or 40 years of service, if he started as a letter carrier, he went up in grade, yes, his compensation was increased, and longevity, but I don't know of any big corporations today that have that sort of record.

I think the men and women in the postal service will have a far greater opportunity to develop their own talents, to advance to positions of responsibility under an organization set up such as is envisaged in this proposal.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I just want to add a note to the Senator's comment. I think this has been overlooked to some considerable extent in the proposal. The opportunity for the employees to, in a true career sense, to move ahead in the service would be built into a government corporation is nonexistent almost totally at the moment. That depresses me more than any other aspect in my experience.

Q. How about the big users, are they pretty much behind this, the big mail users and businessmen?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Some of those who would formerly be opposed, perhaps, to some aspects of this have come forward, recognizing that this can significantly alter their rate, and that is what I guess you are talking about, Hugh. But I think they have been men of good will and many of them have come forward and surprisingly helped us in that effort. Perhaps Red could add to that, but that is my observation.

Postmaster General BLOUNT. They take the position that the mail service is vital to them and they recognize the fact that if something is not done in a few years we may well be in chaos in this postal system.

So in its own self-interest, in recognizing in the short run it may be to their disadvantage, in the long run it is to everybody's interest that postal reform be brought in. I think it is just that simple.

FREEDOM BECOMES ILLEGAL—ONE RESULT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the destruction of the Amite High School in my district Friday night was a tragic and regrettable incident.

I join with the community and the school alumni who have worked so hard to build and maintain the school as an educational center in this their loss.

Yet, this incident and in fact the tension and chaos which continues to exist in my district was not only foreseeable but apparently was a desired effect by some of the unelected bureaucrats and judicrats in the North who talk and teach that violence is necessary to bring about progress.

It can only be a sick mind to see progress in a burnedout schoolhouse. But the school was made of brick, wood, and mortar. It can be rebuilt. The far more serious loss is destruction of the public education system and with it the future

of the human family—a loss that is irreplaceable.

What flimsy excuse can social mechanics, HEW, and Federal judges offer parents and taxpayers—those who built and paid for the schools only to have them confiscated and some now physically destroyed?

The conflagration which consumed the Amite High School was ignited in 1954 by Earl Warren and his liberal left-wing northern friends just as surely as if they had set the blaze.

Let us put the blame and cause where it belongs and not with the people.

Every hypocritical northern liberal, every apathetic northern moderate should recognize their guilt and their role in this loss to my people.

Punishing my people with smears and name-calling, more force laws, compliance threats, and court orders will not reach the cause nor mitigate the undesired effect.

Responsible government authority must restore to the people their rightful freedoms under God otherwise we can anticipate that people who have known freedom will react to continued tyranny as free men have done throughout history.

I include a news clipping on the school fire and correspondence from a constituent following these remarks:

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State Times, Sept. 6, 1969]

AMITE SCHOOL HIT BY BLAZE

AMITE.—Amite High School was completely gutted by a fire which burned through much of the night last night and was finally brought under control early this morning.

Tangipahoa Parish school officials and school board members were holding a special emergency meeting this morning in an attempt to work out a way to get the some 700 students who attended the school started in classes next week.

Officials refused to speculate on the cause of the blaze, or whether arson might be involved. They said state fire marshals and other law enforcement officials were investigating the cause of the fire this morning.

School Supt. Dewitt Sauls said this morning that the school was "completely burned out." The second floor of the building was destroyed, he said, and the lower floor was gutted. "Mostly, the walls are all that is left," Sauls said.

Amite Fire Department officials said the blaze was reported at about 10:40 p.m. yesterday by a group of students returning from a football game at Franklinton on a school bus.

The fire had a "good start" when firemen arrived, the fire department spokesman said.

The fire was brought under control and the last flames extinguished at about 7:30 a.m. today, he said. Firemen were still pouring water on the smoldering ruins at about 9 a.m.

The three units of the Amite Fire Department were assisted by units from Hammond, Roseland and Independence in fighting the blaze. The fire department spokesman said that had it not been for the assistance of these units, the fire could not have been controlled.

FOUR FIREMEN INJURED

Four firemen, three from Hammond and one from Amite, were carried to Lallie Kemp Memorial Hospital at Independence suffering from smoke inhalation and exhaustion during the night, the spokesman said. He said the four men were reported in good condition this morning.

Students returning from the football game carried books, trophies, desks and school records from the burning building until deputies forced them to stop because of the danger of the ceiling falling in on them.

The fire department spokesman said the blaze seemed to have started in the school auditorium, in the general area of the stage. The auditorium is near the center of the two-story brick building, constructed around 1927.

Supt. Sauls estimated this morning that it would take about a half million dollars to replace the school. He said that it was damaged beyond repair.

In the meantime, school officials must find some means to educate the some 700 students in grades 9-12 who attended the school. Sauls said the platooning of students from the school with those at another school was being considered, along with the possibility of obtaining sufficient portable classrooms to operate on a limited basis.

BOGALUSA, LA.,

August 6, 1969.

Re children's education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

To the Representatives of the United States of America:

I, as a citizen and a parent, would like to bring to your attention the problems that you have created as to the Education of Children in these United States. I not only mean the Children of the Southern Part of the United States, but the East, West, and Northern Areas. It is a disgrace that there have been so much confusion and interference when it comes to a child's education. It is not only the right of each parent according to the Laws of each State to send their children to school regardless of where they send them but also their privilege. If you are financially able to send them off to a private school, that may be to their benefit as well as yours. If you are not financially able, we have a public school system that is supported by the taxes collected from Property Taxes and Federal Grants. Please correct me here, if this is not correct that the Federal Grants are primarily the taxes paid by the citizens of this country. The property taxes paid are kept within the State and the Town School Board has jurisdiction as they are an elected body and will usually try to be fair to all in their community, so as to be retained on these Boards.

If you are wondering what I am implying, I would like to say this, that my child's education is my chief concern. I have two children, a daughter 13 years of age and a son 7 years of age. I have taught my children to respect young and old alike and I believe that they do this the very best for their ages. I have also taught them to be careful who they associate with as they wear their own Price Tax and that their Name is their Honor. I am not fanatical in any way, and I treat everyone as I would want to be treated. I have as many colored friends as I know and as many white friends as I know. I call all these people my friends, but I do not mix with all these people socially. The reason is that as long as I have life in my body I will be my own judge as to the kind of education that I want for my children and the people that I would like them to associate with. I believe and I know that I am not mistaken that this is just what everyone of you as representatives and as family men believe in too. This is what the constitution is and what it was written for: Our personal freedom. The Civil Rights law in itself gave the Colored People of these United States their Freedom of Choices. The more that is added to this the more that is taken from someone else.

I took my child out of a Private School because according to my way of thinking, she was not getting the kind of education

that I thought would carry her through her future. It may have been just Basic, but the Basics is what we have to start our future Adult Citizens with. I enrolled her in the Bogalusa Public School System as I felt she had qualified School Teachers and a Qualified Curriculum. That was my privilege and I did what I believed in and what I believed would benefit my child. I still feel like this and it is shameful to see Federal intervention in our Schools as to the placement and without "freedom of choice".

It is not the Constitution of these United States that have given these appointed judges this type of Authority but Federal Appointments. These are not elected men. They do not have to account to the people but only to personal friends. I believe that the Three (3) Branches of our Federal Government are to keep the Balance of Democracy. But if it comes to the Public to call for the election of the Judicial Branch of Government, I now see that the people of the United States will vote for not against these Elections.

I know that I have gone into more than I had started to say, but this is something that has been building for the past fifteen (15) years and if you will just stop using the people and their children as political footfalls and start thinking about the majority and the benefits for them, I know that you will understand that; you have not done your duty as representatives for your country and constituents.

Cordially yours,

MARY ALICE SMITH.

UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING FORCE—THE FIRST BRIGADE

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, this country is withdrawing from a wasteful and tragic conflict in Vietnam with the resolve that alternative methods to American intervention must be found to keep the peace. In this search, I feel that our attention may profitably be focused on the United Nations. Some 11 years ago, Congress passed a concurrent resolution which urged that there should be developed procedures to "enable the United Nations promptly to employ suitable United Nations forces for such purposes as observation and patrol in situations that may threaten international peace and security"—House Concurrent Resolution 373, 85th Congress.

Now is the time, finally, to implement the provisions of this resolution. Consequently, I have today reintroduced a resolution providing for the establishment of a 1,000-man American unit to be on constant call for service with the United Nations. This force would serve as a symbol of American commitment to the peacekeeping efforts of the United Nations and to the ultimate creation of a permanent, individually recruited force for impartial peacekeeping duties.

International intervention serves several valuable ends which unilateral activity cannot. Among other benefits, the multilateral approach can help diffuse the immediate crisis and buy time; it can, through third party fact-finding and peace observatory, reduce factual uncertainty about the origin and initiation of the conflict. Perhaps most importantly,

however, it reduces the risk of direct U.S. and U.S.S.R. confrontation, with its ominous dangers of escalation. Undoubtedly there will be instances, such as those covered by the individual and collective self-defense provisions of the U.N. Charter—article 51—where unilateral response will be required. But, even here, after the initial reaction has been made, a lengthy conflict might be avoided through the use of international agencies.

THE MIDEAST EXAMPLE

Such multilateral international action has, indeed, earned a respected place in the arsenal of weapons for world peacekeeping. In the Middle East, a 6,000-man U.N. emergency force maintained the armistice for almost 11 years before being withdrawn, significantly, on the eve of the 6-day war. United Nations intervention in the Congo, while hampered by the internal complications of the dispute, prevented the implantation of the cold war in Africa. The present peace on Cyprus stems largely from the activities of units from seven different countries stationed there. And most recently, the presence of San Salvadoran troops in Honduras was ended by the threat of OAS retribution.

But multilateral intervention has not been without difficulty. As the process emerged after the Suez crisis in 1956, it entailed the voluntary provision of troop units by U.N. member governments, dependence for logistic support on the larger powers, executive administration by the Secretary General, and unsatisfactory patterns of financing which, in recent years, have relied in large measure on voluntary contributions by U.N. members. The constant dependence on voluntary contributions of funds and military personnel has left the United Nations without the capacity to make the rapid responses which crisis situations demand. It has also meant that vast energies have had to be expended merely to garner support and that the costs of each operation have been borne disproportionately among the members.

A STANDBY BRIGADE

The provision, by each member state, of a standby brigade would eliminate these difficulties. Subject to General Assembly or Security Council action, these forces would mean the availability of ready troops and support completely financed by the donor country. Already such units exist in the armed forces of 10 of our allies, including Canada, Denmark, Italy, and the United Kingdom.

The time is particularly ripe for an initiative by the United States in this direction. Since 1964, the Soviet Union has voiced a willingness to consider the whole issue of a United Nations force under article 43 of the Charter. By scheduling a conference to discuss this matter and taking the first concrete step towards developing such force, the United States will appear in a highly favorable light. We will possibly regain some of our prestige as a promoter of world peace, a reputation somewhat eclipsed by our involvement in Vietnam.

What follows is part of a recent report of the United Nations Association of the United States of America. Included are

the recommendations of that body's Policy Panel on Multilateral Alternatives to Unilateral Intervention, chaired by Kingman Brewster, Jr., president of Yale University, and having among its members Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, former Army Chief of Staff, and Charles W. Yost, Ambassador to the United Nations:

RECOMMENDATION OF THE PANEL

The Panel believes the national security interests of the United States require a re-assessment of the instruments on which we place principal reliance for international conflict control. To deter and avoid nuclear war it is essential that a strategic balance with the Soviet Union be maintained. It is also essential that we maintain our principal defense alliances. But to cope with the many conflict situations around the world, it is imperative, the Panel believes, that means be found, promptly, for a larger number of countries to share more fully the responsibility for international peacekeeping. It would be a mistake for the United States to continue carrying, or attempting to carry, so much of the responsibility alone.

There is likely in the future to be even greater political resistance, both domestic and international, to essentially unilateral efforts to keep the peace or to control "foreign" conflicts. This in itself is reason for the United States to give urgent priority to the development of other means of conflict control.

There is clearly at present no reliable multilateral approach to the control of international conflicts. The United Nations operations in the Middle East, in the Congo and in Cyprus have not been quick, clean and assured of success. But the Panel believes that the growing convergence of U.S. and Soviet national interests in avoiding a nuclear war, and in preventing the escalation of small conflicts into superpower confrontation, now justifies new efforts to strengthen substantially the principal multilateral instruments for conflict control, including those of the United Nations. Such efforts would, the Panel is convinced, coincide sufficiently with the national interests of other key Members of the United Nations to permit progress to be made.

There are indications that the USSR may be interested in a revival of negotiations on the provision of national military units to the UN Security Council (under Article 43 of the Charter) for international peacekeeping service. The Panel believes the time has come, through initial explorations and, if these are productive, through more formal negotiations, to attempt to develop a more capable United Nations Standby Force. Such a Force would be composed of units from UN Members other than the Permanent Members of the Council; would be supported by adequate earmarked and trained reserves; and would be backstopped by more reliable measures for financing.

The Panel proposes the establishment of a new Peace Fund to finance future UN peacekeeping operations, and urges the prompt liquidation of past peacekeeping debts in a package settlement. It also proposes a series of support measures which it believes could strengthen, importantly, the logistic, communication and command aspects of UN operations.

The Panel believes that peacekeeping through the United Nations and through regional organizations can and should be mutually reinforcing. It suggests that in the future there should be closer relationships between the work of regional organizations and that of the UN. We could then envisage arrangements in which certain national military units were earmarked for service either with the UN or with regional organizations. Such a system might strengthen the peacekeeping capabilities of these institutions.

The measures we have suggested represent, the Panel believes, only a first step—although a major one—in the development of the necessary international peacekeeping capabilities needed in the 1970s. The time and the setting are right for the necessary beginning.

U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL SHOULD DEMAND RELEASE OF TWO TWA HOSTAGES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following letter to Secretary of State William P. Rogers urging him to seek assistance from the United Nations Security Council for the immediate release of two Israeli passengers taken from the hijacked TWA airliner and still being held by Syria as hostages.

It is now 10 days since these people were taken hostage and the conscience of the world cannot permit this outrage against two innocent passengers on an American carrier to continue.

I am puzzled by the silence of our liberal friends in our own country. Where is their voice of outrage against this illegal denial of human rights to two people whose only crime is that they were passengers on an American international carrier?

The letter to Secretary Rogers follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1969.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Ten days have now elapsed since the Trans World airliner was hijacked by Arab terrorists and taken to Damascus. You will recall that all but two of the passengers on this international carrier flying an American flag have been released. I am deeply concerned about the remaining two passengers over whom, I believe, the United States has considerable responsibility, if for no other reason than because they were legal passengers on an American-owned commercial aircraft.

I hereby request that you take appropriate steps as soon as possible to summon a meeting of the Security Council at the United Nations and demand an immediate release of these two passengers.

The only crime that these two Israelis still being detained by the Government of Syria have committed is that they were innocent passengers on an American international air carrier. So far as I can ascertain, this is the first time in modern history that a nation has deliberately detained passengers from an aircraft as hostages for terrorists who hijacked the aircraft.

I am astounded that our country has not taken more forceful action already. I have read with interest your own very strong statement denouncing this international piracy at the time the hijacking occurred. I commend you for this statement, but the statement alone is not enough.

Nor am I at all persuaded by arguments of those who urge no action at this time because of the "delicate" negotiations for the release of these two Israeli citizens.

I believe the most effective means of securing the immediate release of these two passengers on an American aircraft is for the Security Council to serve notice on the Government of Syria that any harm to these two people will bring the strongest retaliation

by the combined membership of the United Nations.

It is unconscionable that the free world has remained silent on this issue for so long. Secretary General U Thant has tried to persuade the International Federation of Pilots Association against the worldwide strike of airline pilots in protest against this hijacking, and even more against the illegal detention of these two Israeli passengers. Mr. U Thant would better serve the cause of justice if he addressed his energy toward a meeting of the Security Council for immediate action.

It is my honest judgment that a continuing failure by the United States and the other major powers to deal effectively with Syria's cruel detention of these two innocent passengers will only beget more actions of terrorism against the United States. We have seen already one example in Brazil and we are now witnessing a tragic story unfold in North Korea.

I urge you to instruct your aides for an immediate petition to the Security Council for an emergency meeting to demand the release of these two passengers. For the United States to delay in providing maximum protection for these two passengers will seriously shake confidence in the integrity of the entire American international carrier fleet and in my judgment will have not only serious moral consequences, but even some economic setbacks.

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress.

MORMON LEADER 96 TODAY

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 96th birthday of President David O. McKay, leader of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. President McKay is the head of a church which has grown from a faithful few in New York to what is now estimated to be almost 3 million members the world over.

As president of the church, he has met with statesmen, kings, noblemen, and five U.S. Presidents. Under his leadership, the church has grown, not only in membership, but also in its physical properties, for three new temples are being constructed—one here in Washington, D.C., and the other two in Utah.

President McKay's accomplishments are many, and I would like my colleagues to read, as I did, one report which appeared in the church section of the Salt Lake Deseret News:

PRESIDENT DAVID O. MCKAY, BUSY AT 96 YEARS

President David O. McKay will celebrate his 96th birthday on Monday, September 8, 1969, with family visits and a quiet day to enjoy the many greetings sent by mail. Honoring President McKay will be a groundbreaking of the Ogden Temple. The President has had a desire to be in Ogden for this event and plans to attend if health will permit. President McKay works from his apartment-office in the Hotel Utah. He meets with his counselors and others often as he directs the activities of the Church. President and Mrs. McKay attended the opening of the McKay Hospital in Ogden last July and rode in

the Days of '47 Parade on July 24 in Salt Lake City. Physical frailties necessitate the use of a wheel chair and prohibit the President from many of the activities in which he would like to take part. Since he has become President more than 18 years ago—April, 1951—the Church has grown in size from 1,137,000 to 2,884,973. The number of wards has increased from 1,666 to 4,507 and the number of stakes from 191 to 492. President McKay has taken great pride in the growth of the Church and the devotion of the people. Five temples have been constructed under his presidency. Three more have been approved and work will begin soon on these temples in Washington, D.C., Ogden and Provo, Utah. Contracts have also been awarded for the 25-story Church Administration Building scheduled for completion in 1972.

Under Church correlation, growth and progress has been experienced in every area of the Church. All who meet and know President McKay have been impressed with his abilities and capacity to serve. Men and women from all walks of life who have visited him have been received in a courteous, uplifting way. President McKay has a great capacity to love and serve. He enjoys being with people. He values his association with the brethren with whom he works. His family means so very much to him, and a visit from any one of them brings light to his face. President McKay shows a special gratitude to his staff and those who help him in his overwhelming responsibilities. The President not only responds with love to people he meets, but they also respond to him. The Tabernacle Choir and other choirs who sing at Conference are touched by the spirit of President McKay. Oftentimes they sing with tears in their eyes. President (Hugh B.) Brown announced while conducting a recent Conference that Brother Richard P. Condie suggested that the choir be permitted to sing President McKay's choice of all hymns, "I Need Thee Every Hour." They would do this to honor our President.

DANIEL J. RONAN

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent vacation recess of the Congress one of our distinguished colleagues, Congressman Dan Ronan, of Illinois, was called to his great reward. This was a great shock to all of us when we learned of his passing.

It is difficult for one to understand why a person so young, so able, and so eager to serve the people should be suddenly taken from us.

Congressman Ronan was only 55 years of age. For 2 years he served in the Illinois State Assembly and until his election to Congress was alderman in the city of Chicago. For 13 years he represented the 30th ward in the city council.

Dan and I were of opposite political faiths. Very few major issues came before the Congress on which he and I were in agreement. His philosophy of government was not the same as mine. Nonetheless, I respected him for his views and I am sure he respected me for mine. While we differed on various legislative matters, we were as one in seeking to do what we considered best for the State of Illinois and for our country.

Dan will be long remembered by all who had the privilege to know him. He was a dedicated public servant. He will be greatly missed in the Congress.

I extend my personal sympathy to his mother and his two sisters.

LEAD POISONING

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the plague of lead poisoning among our city children continues to exist and is being perpetuated.

Until recently the nature and effects of this disease have been largely ignored. But there now is a greater public awareness which should lead to remedial action. It affects children who eat bits and pieces of old lead-based paint which peels off of the walls of substandard housing and falls within easy reach of young children.

This disease is usually not reported until after it has reached its most critical stages. At this point lead poisoning results in epilepsy, cerebral palsy, permanent mental retardation, and death.

It has been estimated that between 25,000 to 30,000 children a year suffer from lead poisoning in New York City.

I have introduced three bills, H.R. 9191, H.R. 9192, and H.R. 11699 which are aimed at alleviating and, hopefully, terminating this silent epidemic. These bills were reintroduced in July with 18 cosponsors as H.R. 13256, H.R. 13254, and H.R. 13255.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article which appeared in the September 1 edition of the New York Times. It concerns a summer survey done in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn by Brooklyn College, Brookdale Hospital, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The survey findings showed that there is a high incidence of lead poisoning in the children living in the Brownsville area. Forty-five percent of the families visited in a door-to-door survey were affected and half of the cases required hospitalization.

I urge my colleagues to support legislation which will combat and eradicate lead poisoning.

The article follows:

BROWNVILLE PLAGUED BY PAINT POISONINGS

A survey conducted by Brooklyn College, the Brookdale Hospital and the Neighborhood Youth Corps has found a high incidence of lead poisoning among children living in Brownsville tenements.

Brooklyn College said yesterday that more than 45 per cent of the families visited in the door-to-door survey were found to have some evidence of lead poisoning and that half of these cases required hospitalization.

The college said that 400 interviews were conducted in the summer survey and that 182 cases of suspected lead poisoning were referred to Brookdale Hospital.

"All of the referred cases were found to have lead poisoning," the college said, "and

94 were severe enough to require hospitalization."

PAINT IS THE CAUSE

Children living in slum neighborhoods develop lead poisoning by eating chips of paint bearing heavy amounts of lead. The paint industry halted production of lead-based paints for interior use 20 years ago, but in many slum houses old accumulations of lead-based paint remain.

Last March health officials estimated that between 112,000 and 225,000 children—most of them under 5 years of age—fell victim to lead poisoning last year. About 25,000 to 30,000 children a year suffer from lead poisoning in New York City.

In May a 2-year-old Newark girl died of lead poisoning, and seven other youngsters were hospitalized after they ate paint and plaster from a tenement wall.

Lead poisoning, which has been called "the silent epidemic," causes nausea, crankiness, vomiting and lassitude in its more minor forms. When the level of poisoning increases to more than 80 milligrams in the blood stream, the lead destroys nerve cells and can cause irreparable brain damage and death.

TREATMENT WITH DRUGS

Lead poisoning can be treated with drugs that draw the metal out of the human system.

Irene Impellizzeri, associate dean of teacher education at Brooklyn College, noted that lead poisoning often impairs its victim's ability to function in school. Commenting on the Brownsville survey, she said:

"If these statistics are applicable to the entire Brownsville community, it may turn out that what has long been considered problems of remedial education may better be treated by doctors rather than teachers."

Dean Impellizzeri said that existing methods of preparing teachers to identify medical problems among their pupils were "totally inadequate."

"There is no telling," she said, "how many young students were written off as slow learners or even as retarded when they were simply manifesting symptoms of lead poisoning."

The Brownsville survey was conducted by eight interviewing teams, each consisting of a Brooklyn College teacher trainee and a youth from the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The teacher trainees received medical orientation from the staff of Brookdale Hospital's Comprehensive Child Care Program.

THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD C. BRUCE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 31, in the early evening, a good friend and former colleague, Donald C. Bruce, passed away unexpectedly in Round Hill, Va. I was especially shocked and saddened, for I had spoken to Don just several weeks before, and his concern for the welfare of our Nation remained as intense as ever.

Circumstances and a similarity in political philosophies combined to make our friendship an unusually close one during our 4 years together in the House. Don and I had arrived in 1961 as freshmen Members; we had served on the same committees; we had compared notes together for hours on end in our adjoining offices during the 87th and 88th Congresses. I had a unique opportu-

nity to learn why the people of Indianapolis and the 11th Indiana District chose Don to speak for them in Washington.

The oath of office was no mere formality to Don Bruce. To him it was a solemn contract which he made with the people of his district and the Nation. A driving faith in his religious beliefs and in the U.S. Constitution compelled him to spend himself in a widely ranging concern for issues both domestic and foreign. With justification did the Washington Star in its obituary state that Don was "concerned about the country's moral and spiritual erosion and the threat posed by communism."

Don never lost his faith in the ability of the American people to do what was right when properly informed. To this end he turned his gift as an eloquent public speaker, traveling countless miles to all sections of this Nation, persuading and encouraging people in stations high and low to oversee the affairs of government of which they are the final custodians. To how many he imparted a newly awakened sense of personal responsibility for the welfare of our country, we in this life can never record.

As a citizen Don Bruce was in love with the history and traditions of his country; as a legislator he came to appreciate more fully the genius of our forefathers in designing this Government. While realizing that ours is a government of laws and not of men, he prayed for leaders in the image of our Founding Fathers, closing many an address in these words of Josiah Gilbert Holland:

God, give us men! A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog,

In public duty and in private thinking;
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,

Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land and waiting Justice sleeps.

To his wife, Hope, and to his children, Patti and Bruce, I extend my deepest sympathy. With them, we can take consolation in that Divine Providence will not be outdone in bestowing His rewards on each of His faithful servants.

FREEDOM BECOMES ILLEGAL—THE STRUGGLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming more aware and incensed as freedom of choice is denied

to them in selecting schools for their children.

The American who has known freedom reacts in many ways upon learning he has lost it.

One such fight for the freedom and religious preference of his child is the story of a lawsuit which has been filed by a minister in Florida.

If forced segregation was immoral and now illegal, how can forced integration be found moral and legal?

I insert a news clipping from the Jacksonville, Fla., Times Union for Friday, September 5, following my remarks:

MINISTER SUES TO HAVE SEGREGATION RETURNED

(By Otis Perkins)

A segregationist church minister here is asking in a federal court suit that his daughter be allowed to attend all-white classes or that the government pay her way in a private school.

The suit by Rev. William V. Fowler makes a shotgun attack on "forced" integration, saying it violates the constitutional rights of his minor child, Dana Snow Fowler, of freedom of religion and to attend a school of her choice.

Fowler, who is becoming a familiar figure in U.S. District Court here, says racial segregation is an inherent doctrine of his church, the II Covenant Church of Jesus Christ.

He alleges school integration by judicial mandate forces his child to violate her own religious beliefs—therefore is in violation of the constitutional ban on religious legislation—and takes away other rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

Fowler said he learned Aug. 27 his daughter would have a Negro teacher and requested her transfer to a school with an all-white class. He said the request was repeated when classes began Sept. 2, but that the school principal said the matter was out of her hands, that she was bound by a federal court integration order.

Fowler filed 15 exhibits, including Biblical references by which he claims segregation is a command of God.

The suit adds:

"After having it clearly stated to us that our beliefs and rights would not be rejected we were compelled to withdraw our child from public school. This is against our wishes and the wishes of Dana," demanding she be allowed to return to a school of her choice.

He then cites a school prayer decision:

"In the Madalyn Murray case the courts held that if a child who had no religious beliefs attended a public school and was forced to hear even the simplest prayer their constitutional rights were violated.

"We further state that churches other than ours as a cardinal principle preach integration of the races (National Council of Churches, Federal Council of Churches) as a religious view, and in effect the federal government is endorsing these religious views by establishing and enforcing same in public schools.

"Therefore Dana is compelled to accept the doctrines of other religious ideologies and churches which are enforced by the state, thus establishing a state religion, all in violation of her constitutional rights."

He alleges forced integration to obtain "racial balance" violates the 9th, 10th and 14th amendments of the Constitution as well as public law. It adds:

"Forced integration in schools impairs the educational opportunities of children of all races; that the causes of gross difference justifying segregation are genetic, not environmental, and will not be changed by integration..."

The suit asks an injunction against the United States and its officials, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the State of Florida and its officials, the State Board of Health. It asks payment of damages to cover the cost of private school and \$100,000 in attorney fees, "if one is needed."

Fowler was tried in January on a charge of assaulting an FBI agent. The jury couldn't agree and the charge was dismissed. On Aug. 22 he sought unsuccessfully a federal court injunction against Jacksonville police he said were harassing his church.

TECHNOCRACY: DESPOTISM OF BENEFICENT EXPERTISE

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the problems caused by advanced technologies are coming under increasingly informed scrutiny. While we all admit that unparalleled abundance is technology's prime product, numerous nagging doubts have surfaced. My own activities in evaluating psychological testing, computer technology, and credit bureau operations have been to isolate the toxic in the tonic of technology.

An extremely valuable review of current books on the subject was published in the September 1, 1969, issue of *The Nation*. Mr. Theodore Roszak surveys these books with both a keen mind and, perhaps even more important, a deeply committed humanist viewpoint. Witness his response to a proposal to scientifically measure value systems held by Americans:

How does one drive it home to such academic cold fish that their project, serviceable as it is for purposes of technocratic consolidation, is misconceived *ab initio*? As Socrates knew 2,500 years ago, to enter the agora simply to survey the so-called values of a befuddled public is the betrayal of philosophy. The values of men are not to be measured or predicted but to be honestly debated, affirmed and deeply lived, so that we may educate one another by mutual example. It is *this* that we owe one another as fellow citizens.

One of the things that Congressmen owe their fellow citizens is to attempt to insure that Government fosters human values and does not allow them to be drowned by what Mr. Roszak calls expertise, being committed to that self-congratulatory form of alienation called objectivity.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to un-befuddle Americans by turning them over to an allegedly benevolent technocracy, nor can we lead our Nation out of its current agonies by imposing the value structures of an elite. I would point out that the title of Mr. Roszak's forthcoming book is "The Making of a Counter Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition." The more I learn of the various schemes to uplift our society by denying our traditions and entrusting ourselves to totally "think-tank" solutions, called so aptly by Anthony Oettinger, "the

seductive power of absurdity in full formalized attire," the more I believe that former New York Governor and Democratic candidate for President in 1928, Al Smith, had it exactly right:

The only cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy.

And I would only add that I feel that means full democracy for every American who is willing to admit that another's rights must be protected and cherished as vigorously as he protects and cherishes his own.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roszak has written a valuable article and I am pleased to introduce it into the RECORD at this point:

TECHNOCRACY: DESPOTISM OF BENEFICENT EXPERTISE

(By Theodore Roszak)

Our society advances towards technocracy along many paths. The authors assembled here for review help us count the ways. Some—bravura technicians like Buckminster Fuller—crusade flamboyantly toward the regime of scientific expertise, flying banners in behalf of an *outré* social engineering whose goal is nothing short of "world planning." Others, like the members of the Pittsburgh Values Project, smooth the way more subtly by laboring to convert our capacities for evaluation and taste into a new behavioral technics accessible only to the academic specialist. Some, like the industrialist Simon Ramo, seek to clear the obstacles of traditional politics from our line of advance by entrusting our social problems to the objective competence of the systems analysts. Others, like Michael Reagan investigating the nearly total dependence of science on federal patronage, speed us along our way by celebrating the virtues of the alliance, while assuring us that any vices accruing can be easily adjusted by vigilant administration within the corridors of power. Even those like Victor Ferkiss who view the journey with a critical eye, contribute to our progress toward technocracy by conceding far more to the technician's world-view than their humanistic instincts should permit. The result is frail resistance in the face of a massive historical movement whose seriousness we underestimate at the peril of our human dignity.

No doubt there is room to disagree about the extent to which a technocratic totalitarianism has been developing in our society. I believe we have gone too far in this direction and that the technocracy, despite the stubborn survival in our midst of sundry flat-earthers and dilettante occultists (as well as a growing population of hip young swamis), looks more like the wave of the future for all industrialized nations, regardless of official ideology, than anything else now in sight. In any event, a lively concern for that prospect is the best touchstone for evaluating the burgeoning literature on technology and society. Is the writer aware of the technocratic possibility? Does he welcome or resist it? Is he aware of the force technocratic tendencies exert upon our politics and our total culture, of the costs and losses to which they can lead? Such are the questions I find myself persistently asking whenever I come upon still another diagnosis of our high industrial agonies.

Technocracy, Jean Meynaud says in his important anatomy of the beast, stems from "the pressure of technology on the political system." It is the demand "that politics be reduced to technics." The seed from which technocratic politics sprouts first blossoms in the field of industrial invention and organization, the obvious province of technical intelligence. But the high yield which man's engineering talents achieve there, bolstered by the technician's claim to scientific ra-

tionality, eventually encourages the same habits of mind to embrace social life as a whole. As Meynaud puts it:

Founded on the advances of scientific thought . . . modern technique becomes, in its broadcast sense, all those methods which allow man to make best use of existing resources to satisfy his material needs and common ideals. . . . Technique is not confined to a limited sector of society: it is society looked at from a certain perspective.

The perspective, that is, of technician and scientific intellectual.

Regarded in this light, as a product of both the scientific and industrial revolutions, technocracy assumes a formidable cultural momentum. Its legitimacy reaches deep into all that modern Western man has come to consider good, true and beautiful: affluence, empirical knowledge, and prodigious material power over his environment. As a social form, it is the irresistibly logical consequences of what science tells us reality is and of what technicians tell us can rationally be done to manipulate that reality.

The essays in Lynn White's *Machina Ex Deo* provide a keen examination of the larger cultural context out of which our science and technology evolve. His book—which includes the superb essay, "The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis"—is a model of concerned and elegantly literate scholarship for the general reader. One could not ask for a more sensitive approach to the now submerged religious origins of industrialism: "the sources of our faith in science today and . . . the well-springs of motivation that lead man to pursue science."

White is far more sanguine about the prospects of a "new humanism" arising among the engineers than I can be. As a medievalist, he tends to see scientists and technicians as still the free spirits and rugged individuals they were before they tasted power and the corruptions attending. The transition from "little science" to "big science" (to use Derek de Solla Price's terms) has taken a greater toll of the pristine ideals of scientist and engineer than White may realize. How much of the Christianity of the catacombs survived into the age of Innocent III? Perhaps as much of Galileo and Edison survive in the age of Edward Teller and C. P. Snow. Still, White is correct in identifying technology as "a prime spiritual achievement," an expression of mankind's tireless search for "a new order of plenty, of mobility, of personal freedom." It is only by drawing upon such vital desires that the technocrats could achieve the great moral and psychic power they hold over our allegiance. Technocracy, far from being only an opportunistic and cynical plot (and the worst social evils never are), is a proud, noetic citadel solidly based on all that scientific inquiry has accomplished after the dark millennia during which man was supposedly sunk in superstition, mythological guesswork and helpless bewilderment. The policies that emanate from the citadel are born of pure reason and generous intention; its custodians are those who qualify as disinterested experts in all aspects of life—or, at one highly important remove, those who control the services of such experts.

One senses how domineering the regime of experts has become when one recognizes the lengths to which contemporary radicalism must go in seeking to outflank its values and metaphysical assumptions. An eloquent example of such an effort is Gary Snyder's *Earth House Hold* which seeks to recall the ecological intelligence to be found in poetic and primitive life styles. For Snyder, who learned his social theory from Zen masters and redwood trees, our salvation depends upon recapturing the spirit of "the ancient shamanistic-yogic-socioeconomic view" in which there abide "the most archaic values on earth: . . . the fertility of the soil, the magic of animals, the power-vision in solitude, the terrifying initiation and rebirth,

the love and ecstasy of the dance, the common work of the tribe."

The audience for Snyder's rhapsodic appeal is small, largely the young and the dropped out who cling on and make do, chanting mantras at the social margins; "the tribe" as Snyder calls them, referring to those like the sod brethren of the Berkeley People's Park whose delicate experiment in Arcadian communitarianism the Governor and University of California have determined to trounce out of existence. Unhappily, visionaries like Snyder are regarded as the heretics-in-residence of our pluralistic technocracy, and their words make light weight in the scales of power. Not that society is closed to visionary declarations. Visionary technology—of the World's Fair, science-fiction variety—easily wins spellbound regard; for the millions, it monopolizes the whole meaning of imaginative daring. They will starve their poor to finance Project Apollo; they will sacrifice their peace of mind to have supersonic airliners split the skies above their cities with the sound of progress; they wait with bated breath to have their gene pools programmed for the guaranteed production of talented and beautiful progeny. Those who speak the language of numbers and technologists never lack for reverent if bewildered public attention, and the bolder the scientific impresarios become, the greater the awe and acquiescence. One hundred million Americans may attend church every Sunday, bringing with them superstitions and prejudices as old as the Stone Age. But when they exclaim rhetorically, of Harvard's Program on Technology and Society. Indeed, the program would seem to have its future course well surveyed if it were to extend Oettinger's critique to the relations between technology and society generally.

Clearly the job needs doing. It is wholly disheartening to review the evidence Oettinger presents of our society's scientific gullibility and gadget mania—in this case from the U.S. Office of Education down to the smallest local school board—and of the cynical flummoxing perpetrated by industry and eager-beaver systems analysts. In education as in all other areas of our life, we are indeed paties for what Oettinger calls "the seductive power of absurdity in full formalized attire." And, sad to say, as sharp a critic as Oettinger himself can have his blind spots in this respect. Even he grants that systems analysis, for all its limitations in the field of education, is properly at home in the Defense Department. Quoting Charles Hitch (now President of the University of California, via RAND), Oettinger agrees that it "is easier to program and to analyze [military strategy] quantitatively than many areas of civilian government. For example, it is certainly easier than the foreign affairs area."

That is a fatal, but revealing admission. For after what fashion has Defense Department policy become more adaptable to systems analysis? By subordinating to its oppressively quantitative and value-neuter demands every aspect of life that gets in the way (including "the foreign affairs area"). In brief, systems analysis has "worked" for our society's infinitely expansive conception of military necessity precisely as it purports to "work" for our educational problems: by flattening every non-quantitative consideration beneath a steam roller of dehumanized logic.

It is the great claim of the systems approach that it embraces all facets of every problem. It purports to blanket the whole with coordinated competence, leaving nothing to intuition or amateurish improvisation: meaning, it leaves nothing to the layman. This claim to comprehensiveness, however, is fundamentally false. Systems methodology by its very essence stops short of taking into critical consideration the whole of society, economy, environment, or the human condition. Such wholes are what Ramo calls "too big a system." He warns us:

"Surround the problem too broadly, try too hard to be absolutely complete, and you will not only get nowhere in the solution of the problem, but you will be doing a terribly poor job of systems engineering."

In what sense are such systems "too big"? Why, too big to be handled in the specialist's value-neuter framework. To think on such a scale is to aspire beyond amoral measurements and partial adjustments toward philosophical comprehension and social criticism, and doubtless toward many embarrassing questions about the likes of Simon Ramo, his fortune and influence in contemporary America.

It is revealing of the technocratic temperament that Ramo should finish his treatise by projecting the "golden age" that will ensue "once most people are wedded to creative logic and objectivity to get solutions to society's problems." Logic and objectivity: translated (with a deal of legerdemain) from mathematics and physics into the professional study of society, are science's gift to the apologetics of technocracy. One does not moralize about microbes and quasars; *ergo* logic dictates that the objective mind does not moralize about Thompson-Ramo-Wooldridge, thermonuclear deterrence, or the uses of the multiversity. Where the "human factor" is concerned, the systems team may, as Ramo puts it, have to "tap preferences, judge needs, present possibilities, and evaluate alternatives." But it is the experts who will do the tapping, judging, presenting and evaluating: the "chaos" is theirs to cure. And the experts work neither for free nor in a vacuum. As Jean Meynaud makes clear:

"For technocracy to cease being essentially conservative, technicians themselves would have to become inspired with the will to change. . . . But it is not rare for the technician to consider that the social system (one which manifests itself with continuity) is necessary to the realization of his designs. After all, the supporters of Saint-Simon were not lacking in human generosity, but they finally gave the best of themselves to the big industrial undertakings and commercial banks."

For his own France, Meynaud is able to trace the roots of this conservatism to the family and educational background of the highly cliquish Gaullist polytechnicians. Though they are more diffuse in social origin, the regents of the American New Atlantis display the same combination of "technical boldness and social conservatism." What passes for objectivity among those who staff our military-industrial think tanks is an understandable reticence respecting the world-view and social system that justifies and rewards expertise. Nothing could be more quantifiable than the gold in Ramo's "golden age": it measures out in dollars and cents, status and prestige.

This same practiced evasion of all philosophically challenging questions characterizes Michael Reagan's examination of science under the patronage of the government, a study that never once confronts the overarching issue: the political form that must inevitably follow from the progressive assimilation of expertise by forces commanding the bulk of society's cash and privilege. Indeed, Reagan would press the process of assimilation further still. He calls for the funding of a National Foundation for the Social Sciences (on the order of the National Science Foundation) as the best way for social scientists to make "their developmental needs known to government through a regularized internal, differentiated organizational position" and for them "to be in on the choice of problems and of strategies for dealing with them."

What news it would be to Plato and Marx, to Veblen and C. Wright Mills to learn that students of man and society must make their "needs known to government" and must choose their problems and strategies. But

clearly this is a rather different breed of student, one who approaches the Prince with the same power-political promise that has served as sweet bait on the atomic scientist's hook.

Reagan's conception of political science is contained entirely within the corridors of power, where everything that is, is—with minor adjustments—right. Inevitably, then, we reach the cheerful conclusion that the scientists, the multiversities and the government enjoy a "fruitful relationship" bearing "all the earmarks of permanence"; and if there are any problems, they can be rectified by some reshuffling of agencies and funding priorities. Reagan's first priority would go to "social objectives which are defined as most urgent politically." He does recognize, though without alarm, that this process of "definition" is often carried out by "vested interests in government agencies and outside groups." The remedy for this vice, however, is another echelon of supervisory expertise . . . a Technology Assessment Board perhaps . . . or an amalgamation of the Office of Science and Technology with the President's Science Advisory Committee . . . or why not an expansion of JCST . . . or of COSPUP . . . or of OSRD . . . etc., etc.? Reagan's study is a fine reference guide to the C. P. Snow world of the science bureaucracy. But with respect to all the great questions of justice and democracy and intellectual conscience—the issues that drove Norbert Wiener out of the "science factories," that sent Einstein heartsick to his grave, and that have stirred student rebellions across the land—Reagan is totally "objective." His suggestions for reform are eminently practical. He goes no further than to play committeemanship with the expert-administrators.

It would be wrong, however, to suggest that the technocratic mentality at its best lacks concern for values. On the contrary, the professional study of values is, along with technological prognostication ("futures," as the French call it), a hot and highly sophisticated specialty. A volume like *Values and the Future* serves as a twin introduction, authoritative if ponderous, to both the new science of ethics and the "futures industry."

The anthology grows out of a high-powered conference held at the University of Pittsburgh during 1965-66 under grants from IBM and the Carnegie Corporation. The result is academically suave, but hardly encouraging. With the exception of a few of the less pretentious essays such as those by John Kenneth Galbraith and Kenneth Boulding, the anthology deals in the learned superficialities which are the hallmark of technocratic culture: the systematic circumvention of emotional engagement and personal commitment. The essays are filled with baroque methodologies, much statistical virtuosity and esoteric computer games; and these last, as described, achieve levels of absurdity rivaling Ionesco. (Thus, in one of the games, the conferees, in the pursuit of computable statistics, take it upon themselves to "simulate" teen-agers, housewives, cultural elite and "persons in lowest income decile" as of the year 2000. "And that is science, my friend," said Dr. Spalanzani.)

Professionally, it is all quite elegant. But what is it, at last, that technical expertise does with values when it gets hold of them? It treats them like alien organisms under a microscope. It surveys them by way of foolish questionnaires no serious person would agree to complete. (Imagine Tolstoy or St. Paul being asked to give their "relative preferences" and "numerical evaluations" regarding "personality control drugs" and "household robots.") It quantifies them, by way of "weightings" and "scalings" that are the mathematical analogue of a Rube Goldberg contraption. And finally, it predicts their future course, by way of facile computerized techniques—in this case, their course under

the impact of technological forces that are taken to be as inexorable as the will of God.

Not very remarkably, the "findings" that come of such procedures are always upbeat. "The most striking feature of the questionnaire responses is their clear optimism," Nicholas Rescher reports on one of his surveys. But who were the respondents? Fifty-eight experts from IBM, RAND, NSF, and the IBM-financed Harvard Program on Technology and Society. (Are there no laws against such intellectual incest?) Again, to quote Meynaud, "the future is influenced by the picture which men themselves draw of it. . . . One of the trends of 'futurism' is a tendency to exalt the virtues of a technical civilization and the merits of technicians. . . ."

In the introduction to *Values and the Future*, Alvin Toffler declares that "we need systematic surveys of the value systems held by important American subcultures, by different professions, age groups and socioeconomic groupings." It is surely a call for a million years of "extensive—and expensive—empirical research." But, Toffler feels, only this will give the specialists what they need as they set about "drawing up their reports in forms that can be taken into account in cost-benefit appraisals." Ideally, he anticipates a new profession of "Value-Impact Forecasters" who will be "armed with scientific tools" and "located at the hot center of decision-making" as "part of every corporation, research laboratory, government agency and foundation whose output includes technological innovation."

Surely it is the perfection of technocracy when values become statistical grist for the research mill. Once such a great project is launched, shall we not then be assured that all the goods and evils of policy and decision have been taken competently into account—with logic and objectivity—by the court wizards? And what will there be left for the layman to worry his amateurish head about?

How does one drive it home to such academic cold fish that their project, serviceable as it is for purposes of technocratic consolidation, is misconceived *ab initio*? As Socrates knew 2,500 years ago, to enter the agora simply to survey the so-called values of a befuddled public is the betrayal of philosophy. The values of men are not to be measured or predicted but to be honestly debated, affirmed and deeply lived, so that we may educate one another by mutual example. It is *this* that we owe one another as fellow citizens. But I doubt that this distinction between the academic and the irreducibly existential would prove persuasive. Expertise, being committed to that self-congratulatory form of alienation called "objectivity," makes no allowance for the person. It discounts the experiential depths and attends to the behavioral surface. What chance would there have been to convince Dr. Kinsey that he had it all wrong? That love is not to be measured but to be fallen into, made, enjoyed and suffered? "But," the scientific mind insists, "there is also matter here (and where is there not?) in need of professional research. For only by professional research do we come to know anything."

And that is the box in which the technocrats have us trapped: their conviction and ours that only the scientific mind—objective, logical, quantitative—has access to reliable knowledge. What other remedy can there be, then, for the ills of mankind in a scientific culture but still more science, still more technology? Was it not scientist and technician who constructed our industrial cornucopia in the first place? Who else can understand its mysteries and maintain its flowing abundance? And maintaining industrial abundance is what everybody's politics is about in our time—Left, Right and Center. It is precisely this epistemological monopoly that legitimizes the shameless self-selection and internal circulation of technical elites

within our military-paramilitary-financial-industrial-multiversity-think-tank-foundation-Presidential-advisory complex.

Here is the point that I believe Victor Ferkiss overlooks when he writes off the possibilities of technocratic totalitarianism. Granted, he is correct in concluding that the American version of the technological society really overlays and serves old-fashioned, bourgeois profiteering. (Technocracy has no difficulty absorbing any social system, provided the system is committed to an expanding economy.) Granted too, he is correct in concluding that the effort to create a totally efficient technocracy—a Huxleyan Brave New World—is more apt to produce a "clumsy monster" constantly on the brink of chaos. But he is wrong in deciding that these facts make "the notion of a scientific elite a myth," rather than a growing reality. For what does the citizen in a scientized culture have by way of knowledge or value to hold against those who are the experts or those who own the experts? Values, as we now learn, are becoming the province of ethical technicians equipped with inscrutable methodologies and expensive computers. Knowledge—the product of logic and objective research—is similarly the property of the experts. True, we may still resist the experts and their employers. But by appeal to what does our resistance lay claim to the sanction of reason, sanity or progress? What is there the citizen can claim to know that an expert somewhere cannot prove he knows better?

I believe that Ferkiss underestimates this mystique of expertise because he himself has fallen beneath its spell. Even he, an admirably humanistic critic, believes that the thrust of science and technique "by giving man almost infinite power to change his world and to change himself" has carried us to the threshold of nothing less than an "evolutionary breakthrough," to which all culture must adapt if we are to produce the mature "technological man." Once concede that this is the proper relationship of science-technology to culture (the former disposes, the latter scurries to adjust) and our political life is delivered into the hands of the technical experts and their patrons. All complies to their world-view and there are no alternative realities. No doubt the technicians will proceed to build us a "clumsy monster" of a social system, a push-button bedlam with music by Muzak; but they will also convince the citizenry—by logic and objectivity—that it is the only rational system. Jean Meynaud's analysis is sharper than that of Ferkiss, and much gloomier.

We might wonder whether the determination to obtain maximal efficiency, combined with greater prosperity in larger sectors of society, is not likely to throw into gear a movement which will lead to progressive monopoly of power by "competence." Supposing that such an evolution occurs, the final end of the scientific society might perhaps be democratic, but its functioning would no longer be so. In the extreme case, a scientific technocracy . . . would replace traditional political machinery, conserving the essential nature of the established order.

One must face the fact that such a despotism of beneficent expertise, guaranteeing both the bread of cybernated affluence and the circuses of moon shots, would, at this point, be far from unwelcome to most of the Americans it was willing to integrate. Perhaps only a handful of wild and woolly drop-outs and stubborn black nationalists would be inclined to resist its invitation to the fat and dependent life. Certainly Meynaud's proposed safeguard—an unspecified strengthening of elected authorities and their institutions wholly within the going industrial system—looks like a very weak reed. This is because it ignores the psychic and metaphysical depths to which the technocracy

reaches in achieving acquiescence and in this way undercutting democratic institutions.

Erich Fromm does greater justice to this dimension of the problem in his *Revolution of Hope*, an inspirational tract that provides a sensitive, if primer-simple assessment of our technological dehumanization. With a shrewd eye for the pathological, he tells us that the main problem . . . is not whether . . . a computer-man can be constructed; it is rather why the idea is becoming so popular in a historical period when nothing seems to be more important than to transform the existing man into a more rational, harmonious, and peace-loving being. One cannot help being suspicious that often the attraction of the computer-man idea is the expression of a flight from life and from humane experience into the mechanical and purely cerebral.

The major weakness of Fromm's treatise lies in the author's eagerness to dish up a rather thin potpourri of specific reforms (though there are several good ideas here) and to launch a new political movement. I doubt that the changes Fromm desires should, or will have the conventional organizational characteristics he suggests: a national committee of notables ("The Voice of American Conscience") reared on a base of local subcommittees. The "psychospiritual renewal" he calls for must perforce be more subtle and spontaneous, and surely less concerned than Fromm is with avoiding "the breakdown of the industrial machine." It will have to get at the millions as insidiously as it has apparently gotten at Fromm himself, whose latest writings begin to reveal a pronounced compromise with his former secularized, Socialist humanism, and a growing disposition to take seriously religious forms of community and personal transcendence.

Fromm does not, to be sure, move far enough in this direction to match the sensuous, primitivist mysticisms of Gary Snyder: "the timeless path of love and wisdom, in affectionate company with the sky, wind, clouds, trees, water, animals and grasses." And his hesitancy is understandable, since to cut so deep seeking the roots of the technocracy means hazarding one's intellectual respectability. But I think it has come to that desperate a pass. Caliban, having acquired the higher mathematics and devised him a clever machinery, hastens to counterfeited his master's magic. We may then need more than a touch of Blake's brave perversity:

To cast off Bacon, Locke & Newton
from Alibon's covering,
To takeoff his filthy garments & clothe
him with Imagination.

Buckminster Fuller surely ranks as dean of the Promethean technicians. Certainly few exert greater personal magnetism among the "think big" younger generation of architects and engineers. Among Fuller's great schemes: his project to house the human race in prefabricated, helicopter-transported geodesic domes (Fuller's most famous and most overpraised invention) and the birth-certificate-universal-credit-card designed to operate anywhere on earth by means of a frequency tuned to the holder's genetic code. Now, in Fuller's latest book, the earth is stripped of its metaphorical motherhood and becomes instead a spaceship in need of nothing so much as properly trained "world planners" in its cockpit. The technocratic world-view could not ask for a more serviceable central image—though it will certainly require a less idiosyncratic "operating manual" than Fuller has to offer.

Some of Fuller's notions—like his "synergistic mathematics"—may have vaguely mystical implications. But he is careful always to protect the respectability of his bizarre brainstorming by disguising it as a form of omni-competent, global engineering.

Like Marshall McLuhan, he is a great bamboozler: a combination of Buck Rogers and Horatio Alger. His intellectual repertory rarely includes a reference to artist, philosopher, poet or prophet. This, along with his anti-academic autodidacticism, makes him decidedly the technocrat Old Style. Yet he manages to lay ham-handedly on the line most of the tacit assumption of the technocratic mentality: that it was only when man became a machine maker that he "began for the first time to really employ his intellect in the most important way"; that invention and efficient organization embracing as they do the whole meaning of Reason and Progress, necessarily improve with increase; and that for every human problem there is a technical solution—sometimes a dazzlingly simple one. Thus: "You may . . . ask me how we are going to resolve the ever-acceleratingly dangerous impasse of world-opposed politicians and ideological dogmas. I answer, it will be resolved by the computer . . . all politicians can and will yield enthusiastically to the computer's safe flight-controlling capabilities in bringing all of humanity in for a happy landing."

To be sure, "General Systems Theory," the form of technical expertise Fuller recommends for the better piloting of "spaceship Earth," is intended to be ambitiously broad-gauged: the very antithesis of the myopic specialization which is Fuller's *bête noire*. The prospectus sounds intriguing, but the social realities behind GST are bound to be unappealing to those who have sentimental attachments to participative and communitarian politics. This form of elitist brains-trusting—an outgrowth of wartime operations research—is apt to be the essential component of the technocracy's *machine à gouverner*.

Those who desire a brief, ebullient account of the systems technique may consult Simon Ramo's *Cure for Chaos*. Ramo, vice chairman of Thompson-Ramo-Woodriddle, father of the ICBM, and, as the book jacket tells us, "frequently consulted by government leaders," is, like Fuller, a self-made technician-entrepreneur. The beneficiary and booster of military-industrial boondoggling, his vision of life is colored accordingly. The archetypal social problem for Ramo is patterned upon the gadgeteering perplexities of the ballistic missile system, where everything including the megadeaths, yields to simple numbers. Ramo readily admits that, in matters involving "the human component," the "systems team" must include "techno-political-economic-socio-experts." Yet systems engineering discriminates not at all between problems of air traffic control and education, the arms race and urban renewal. The problem-solving procedures are identical. One assembles the certified experts and trusts them to convert the project at hand into "specific well-described and often measurable performance requirements." The skill of experts, Ramo tells us, lies in "putting quantitative measures on everything—very often cost and time measures."

Thus, in quantification the systems engineer has found what the alchemists of old sought in vain; the universal solvent. It is little wonder that the fiercely mathematical passion of such expertise finds no trouble in sliding from discussions of thermonuclear weaponry to hospital design in successive paragraphs, or in conceiving of education as something whose value is calibrated in lifetime income differentials and whose substance can be captured at "electronicized desks," where vigilant computers pace their attentive students through true-or-false and fill-in-the-blank testing.

After Ramo's and Fuller's intoxicated high touting of the systems approach and computerized instruction, Anthony Oettinger's *Run, Computer, Run* is sobering reading. Oettinger wisely works from the assumption

that the Himalayan dilemmas of American education are through and through political and philosophical. This means that "systems analysts trained to think unthinkable, apocalyptic thoughts in the style of Herman Kahn, or to calculate the performance/weight tradeoffs for missiles, are ill-prepared to deal with more than the form of the educational system."

The present tools of former systems analysis work best on well-defined, simple, concrete models involving quantifiable concepts, measurable data, and, above all, thoroughly understood theoretical structures which adequately reflect reality.

Since almost nothing about education, beyond perhaps the plumbing of school buildings, yields such convenient simples, Oettinger spends little time on the latest instructional gimmickry and systems techniques. Rather, he devotes himself to debunking the many "highly visible quickie" solutions currently on the scene that offer only "the illusion of progress." One by one, Oettinger undermines the widespread assumptions that teaching machines save money, save time, save manpower, and "individualize" instruction. It is a commendable display of candor from one, who, as director of Project Tact ("Technological Aids to Creative Thought": Harvard based, Defense Department financed), would seem to have every interest in extolling the myths here marked out for destruction. Oettinger's enormously intelligent book is a commendable product "Will wonders never cease!" it is the works of the engineers and not the works of God they have in mind.

SUBSIDIZED LUXURY

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues know, I was among those who joined with many residents of the District of Columbia in protesting the purchase earlier this year of a luxury highrise apartment known as Regency House in Northwest Washington by the National Capital Housing Authority for use as housing for the elderly poor.

Despite the protests of a large segment of the Washington community, the National Capital Housing Authority, with the approval of the mayor of the District of Columbia, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, purchased the property.

Mrs. Shirley Scheibla, associate editor of *Barron's*, a business weekly, has written two excellent articles appearing in *Barron's* on August 11 and 18, which provide many details concerning the Regency purchase never known to the public. As I believe purchases of this type, which the Department of Housing and Urban Development appears to be promoting throughout the Nation, are clearly illegal, I welcome this opportunity to include Mrs. Scheibla's discoveries in the *RECORD* with the hope that others will join me in protesting the continuation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development policies which permitted this costly and wasteful purchase.

The articles follow:

[From Barron's, Aug. 11, 1969]

SUBSIDIZED LUXURY—PUBLIC HOUSING HAS STRAYED INTO QUESTIONABLE AND COSTLY AREAS

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—Shortly after last year's riots here, the Washington (Catholic) Lay Association launched a massive drive to collect money to house the poor. According to the Association's president, it netted pledges of \$127,000, of which \$40,000 promptly went to the National Capital Housing Authority (NCHA), to enable it to purchase Regency House for public housing. Regency is a luxury high-rise apartment building on exclusive Connecticut Avenue, complete with air conditioning, swimming pool, penthouse, recreation room and sheltered parking.

Thanks to other donations, which made up the total difference of \$75,000 between the highest appraisal and the purchase price, NCHA now has acquired Regency for \$2,425,000. The deal not only has aroused the ire of many local residents, but also has brought to a head a storm of controversy with nationwide implications which is reverberating within the halls of Congress.

UNUSUAL VENTURE

For apart from the donations, NCHA bought Regency with federal funds supplied by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The chief justification given for the unusual venture is that it enabled NCHA to carry out a 1965 HUD regulation requiring location of public housing outside areas of minority racial concentration (although whites are a minority in this city). The regulation, however, is of doubtful legality. Moreover, attempts to implement it increasingly look like a disservice to the poor and a windfall for select property-owners.

In some areas, the regulation has brought public housing programs to a virtual standstill. Moreover, it largely ignores the large families which have the greatest need for public housing. In Washington, at least, rents in "non-ghetto" apartments run higher than in regular public housing, thus barring the poorest of the poor.

HUD's policy also is impeding compliance with the Widnall Amendment to the Housing Act of 1968, which requires urban renewal residential projects to include at least 20% housing for low and moderate income families. In addition, it is likely to add to the financial troubles of a large number of local public housing authorities. Finally, it is lowering tax revenues of cities already strapped for funds.

An executive order and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 form the legal basis for HUD's policy. In 1962 President Kennedy issued Executive Order 11063, in which he directed federal agencies to take all action necessary to prevent discrimination in housing owned or operated by the U.S. government. With respect to the 1964 Act, HUD is relying entirely upon language in Title VI, which says, "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."

In August 1965, HUD issued its Low Rent Housing Manual, which directs public housing authorities to select sites giving members of minority groups an opportunity to locate outside of areas of concentration of their own kind. It asserted: "Any proposal to locate housing only in areas of racial concentration will be prima facie unacceptable and will be returned to the Local Authority for further consideration and submission."

Three years later HUD sent the authorities a memorandum reminding them of the site selection rule, and a 1967 amendment which stated: "Local authorities will be expected to utilize available means for resolving any zoning or other city impediments to

compliance with Title VI site selection requirements."

NO PLANS TO CHANGE

The Nixon Administration apparently has no plans to change HUD's policy. Secretary George Romney and Assistant Secretary Lawrence Cox have defended it, while Assistant Secretary Samuel C. Jackson has indicated he might like to go further. In a recent speech before the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund in New York City, he said the Kerner Commission was right in accusing America of racism. Zoning ordinances requiring large minimum-sized lots and single-family home construction, he added, have prevented the construction of low-income apartments, thereby limiting the ability of blacks to move to the suburbs. "The insistence on locating public housing in the central city has also been a considerable force in containing low-income black residents in the ghetto. Only recently has federal policy begun to stimulate balanced public housing locations."

While the policy may be "stimulating," its results so far are deplorable. Edward Aronov, Executive Director of NCHA, told Barron's that because of the racial regulation, HUD refused to approve several acquisitions proposed by NCHA in southeast Washington. One offered 68 two-bedroom apartments and included air conditioning, swimming pool, play area, children's nursery, dishwashers, garbage disposals and parking for 57 autos. With no rehabilitation required, the price was \$10,000 per unit. The 161 smaller apartments at Regency cost \$15,062 each.

WAITING LIST

Meantime, at the end of June, NCHA had 3,978 applications on its waiting list for housing. It expects that number to increase by 300 as a result of a regulation, effective July 1, eliminating the one-year residency requirement for applicants.

Norfolk, Va., provides another outstanding case in point. Last September HUD authorized 1,200 units of public housing for the city. But Norfolk has been able to go ahead with none, according to Charles L. Kaufman, head of the local housing authority. He explained to Barron's that HUD so far has approved no sites because the city has failed to come up with any which the agency does not reject as "racially impacted."

Again, after lengthy negotiations, Pittsburgh succeeded in persuading HUD to approve sites for less than half of 2,000 proposed public housing units, with the understanding that it will find "white sites" to match those approved. In Hackensack, N.J., in Rep. Widnall's own district, HUD is holding up construction of a 100-unit public housing project for the elderly. HUD told Hackensack, in effect, to build another project in a white area to balance the proposed one, or to build the latter in a "white area."

SWING WEIGHT

Rep. Widnall's words swing weight in Congress, since he is the ranking minority member of the House Banking and Currency Committee and its housing subcommittee. Here is what the lawmaker has to say on the matter: "As a long-time advocate of civil rights, I am concerned that this interpretation has entrapped us. . . . Here we have an administrative ruling, based upon an interpretation of the law as yet judicially undecided, that is prohibiting housing activity in slum areas, in urban renewal, and in non-slum areas because there the HUD cost guidelines would be breached. . . ."

Regarding the interpretation of the Civil Rights Act and the effect on his amendment to the Housing Act, the Congressman declares, "I am most disturbed that administrative regulations can defy the law. I do not think that the Executive Department can dictate to the legislative."

Since, as Rep. Widnall notes, the land avail-

able in white areas costs too much, HUD now is financing "acquisitions" of existing apartment buildings for public housing, i.e., purchases without major rehabilitation. This has been practical only since the urban riots of the past two years and the flight to the suburbs of many big-city residents. HUD Associate General Counsel Joseph Bursteln says the result has been that many city apartment properties "came on the market at good prices." He concedes, however, that during a time of shortage the acquisitions are not adding to the housing supply.

LAND SET ASIDE

How "good" the prices are is a matter of interpretation (to be explored in an article to follow). A great deal of land has been set aside in Model Cities for public housing, and, according to Rep. Joel T. Broyhill (R. Va.), HUD is contravening the intent of Congress by holding up construction on these sites and offering instead to purchase a few plush properties.

In addition, many properties which, like Regency, boast such luxuries as air conditioning and swimming pools, are bound to call for increased operating costs. At Regency operating costs are so high that the poorest of the poor won't be able to live there. NCHA is charging a flat monthly rental of \$50 for an efficiency there, compared with a low of \$27 for comparable space elsewhere.

HUD finances construction or acquisition of public housing properties, and in theory the rents collected by local housing authorities must pay operating costs. However, according to Secretary Romney, 15 local housing authorities now are in financial difficulty. They are located in Washington, Kansas City, San Francisco, St. Louis, Columbus, New York, New Haven, Omaha, Boston, Newark, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Louisville and Detroit.

HUD Assistant Secretary Cox predicts other cities will be in trouble next year. Rep. George E. Shipley (D., Ill.), a member of the House Appropriations Committee, agrees, and adds that he is sure Congress will have to provide the money to bail them out. When HUD officials asked the Committee for a supplemental appropriation of \$6.5 million for that purpose recently, Rep. Shipley declared, "It is going to be twice that or three times that the next year, and it is going to build up. . . ."

NO IN-DEPTH STUDY

HUD has made no in-depth study of the financial straits of the 15 aforementioned authorities, and it lacks breakdowns on operating costs for acquisitions compared with other properties. Nevertheless, it plans to step up acquisitions. While 601 units were acquired without major rehabilitation in 1968, it expects to acquire 2,000 in 1969 and 3,000 in 1970.

HUD also is preparing to launch another experiment that will deplete its resources without adding to the housing supply. It plans to spend \$45 million by the end of fiscal 1970 for services to public housing tenants. By authority of the Housing Act of 1968, these will include "counseling on household management, housekeeping, budgeting, money management, child care, and similar matters; advice as to resources for job training and placement, education, welfare, health and other community services; services which are directly related to meeting tenant needs and providing a wholesome living environment; and referral to appropriate agencies when necessary for the provision of such services."

[From Barron's, Aug. 18, 1969]

HIGHHANDED HUD—ITS PURCHASE OF REGENCY HOUSE IS A COSTLY CASE IN POINT

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—"I regret to have to report to you, Mr. Mayor, that the objective of conducting an open forum wherein all of the

facts were presented to the public for discussion was not achieved."

Thus stated Hearing Officer Samuel J. Fusco to Washington's Mayor Walter E. Washington, in a report following a hearing last January concerning the acquisition for public housing of Regency House, a luxury highrise apartment building here on Connecticut Avenue. The mayor's approval was needed for the purchase of Regency by the National Capital Housing Authority (NCHA) with federal funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

The failure to have a full discussion sprang from no lack of interest. On the contrary, about 300 people jammed the hearing room and the outside corridor. Examiner Fusco reported, "The emotions of the audience were very intense, and it was difficult to maintain order."

CONTROVERSIAL PURCHASE

Although NCHA consummated the highly controversial purchase of Regency last May 15 for \$2,425,000, full details still have not been made public. Regency thus serves as an outstanding example of a new trend among housing authorities which enables them to effect transactions with federal funds without full disclosure.

For many years, the federal government has subsidized the construction of public housing projects by local housing authorities. Under this system, the latter openly solicit bids from builders and accept the best one. More recently, however, HUD has been financing "acquisitions," whereby housing authorities buy modern and often luxurious apartment buildings for public housing. (As explained in last week's article, this is being done chiefly as a means of complying with a HUD regulation requiring location of public housing outside areas of minority racial concentration, since in most white areas vacant land for construction isn't available.) It's a bonanza for the sellers, who take accelerated depreciation during the first few years of a property's life, when the tax advantage is greatest, and then dispose of it at a long-term capital gain.

Since such transactions are not governed by the Administrative Practices and Procedures Act, there is no requirement for hearings, nor for a 30-day notice of the impending action. Moreover, HUD does not ask the authorities publicly to solicit offers for possible acquisition, or, before closing a deal, to publish the name of the seller or the purchase price. Thus close scrutiny of what has happened in at least one outstanding case, Regency, seems in order.

BAN OUTLINES

Rep. John L. McMillan (D., S.C.), Chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee, had to turn to U.S. Comptroller General Elmer H. Staats to obtain even the bare outlines of the Regency affairs. Mr. Staats told him in a letter that Murray Levine, a D.C. realtor, approached NCHA on August 2, 1968, with the idea of selling Regency for public housing and, in a letter dated August 20, formally offered it for \$2,700,000.

On September 4, representatives of HUD's regional office in Philadelphia came to town and inspected Regency. According to a letter from Mr. Staats to Rep. McMillan: "They commented on the suitability of the site and estimated that an acceptable acquisition cost would be \$2,433,200."

The Department's regulations specify, however, that it must not subsidize a purchase price in excess of the highest independent appraisal. Accordingly, NCHA obtained two independent appraisals, one for \$2,300,000 and another for \$2,350,000. On October 10, the Authority submitted these to HUD along with a request for approval of the purchase of Regency at \$2,475,000, because "This voluntary offering represents the only likelihood of achieving in the near future a housing project west of Rock Creek,

an objective literally unobtainable heretofore . . . (and) . . . the price indicated is reasonable in view of the site location and related social goals of the public housing program."

FIRST INKLING

On January 14, Mr. Levine stated in writing that he would sell Regency to NCHA for \$2,475,000. Next day the public got its first inkling of what was afoot when the D.C. government placed an official notice, measuring one and a half by three inches, in the classified section of Washington's Evening Star. It said the mayor had ordered a hearing January 30 . . . for the acquisition of Regency House . . . for elderly families and individuals to be displaced by urban renewal, highway construction, code enforcement and other public works programs."

While it described the location in detail, the notice failed to disclose either the prospective seller or the proposed price. Three days later The Washington Post carried a story on Regency which said, in part, "NCHA director Edward Aronov would not disclose the asking price or NCHA's offer for the property. Regency House is jointly owned by Washington realty dealer Murray Levine and a group called Annan, Inc. Levine said he would not answer questions about the building."

On January 26, Clinton B. D. Brown, an attorney who lives near Regency, wrote the D.C. government, in part, as follows:

"(1) The published notice is deficient in that it does not identify the statutory authority for the proposed acquisition.

"(2) The notice is inadequate in that the hearing relates to a proposed action which, in its practical effect, would be tantamount to an amendment of the zoning regulations, for which at least 30 days' notice of public hearing is required by statute, D.C. Code, Sections 5-414 and 5-415.

"It is requested that . . . the hearing be postponed and rescheduled for a later date upon at least 30 days' full and adequate public notice including the specific statutory authority for, and terms of, the proposed acquisition."

Mr. Brown says he received no reply.

PRIVATE BUSINESS

At the hearing, NCHA Director Aronov testified: "Although it is not proper to subject the private business of the owner to public scrutiny at this time, if Regency House is approved for acquisition by NCHA, the sales price and other aspects of the transaction will become a matter of public record."

This prompted F. Joseph Donohue, former head of NCHA and also an ex-D.C. Commissioner, to ask: "On what food does he (Aronov) feed that he thinks he can spend my money and tell me it is none of my damn business how he spends it?"

The League of Women Voters said at the hearing: "The unfortunate lack of details on the financial aspects of the proposal disturbed both supporters and opponents. The League does feel that citizens are entitled to a full presentation of the facts about governmental action."

Joseph O'Neill, president of the Chevy Chase Citizens' Association, referring to the aforementioned Washington Post story and its mention of Annan, Inc., told the hearing, "This corporation is not listed as a District corporation, and consequently it was not possible to find out from any normal local record who the owners of this corporation are. . . ."

Richard O. Haase of the Washington Board of Realtors testified, in part, as follows: "The Washington Board of Realtors finds it incredible that the NCHA has entered into contract negotiations with a private owner without making public its intentions or asking for tenders from other segments of the community. We know of no other government agency that acts in this

manner. To give you a very clear example, it was not until we walked into this very hearing room that we found out what the purchase price was. . . . We can state unequivocally that there is a large supply of apartment units that can be purchased by the NCHA at a fraction of the cost per unit of the Regency House in well-established neighborhoods."

A COVER-UP?

According to the official transcript of the proceedings, Leo Diegelmann, representing the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, said, "The owners, Murray Levine and Annan, Inc., will answer no questions and furnish no information. Is some shady dealing being covered up?"

The next significant event took place on February 14, when the aforementioned Mr. Brown wrote Mayor Washington that public records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds showed that when the land was assembled for the construction of Regency House, it was deeded to Jacob Lehrman, David B. Sykes and Emanuel Cohen as joint tenants with an undivided one-half interest. Apparently they kept this interest until February 9, 1968, when the three men executed a deed transferring their interest to Annan, Inc.

Thus, if Mr. Brown and Comptroller General Staats are correct, Regency was offered to NCHA about four months after Annan acquired a half interest in it. Mr. Staats wrote Rep. McMillan that half of Regency was owned by Murray Levine and his wife, and half by "Annan, Inc.—a Delaware corporation that is related to Giant Food Profit Sharing Plan."

REGISTRATION STATEMENT

A report filed with the Labor Department's Office of Labor Management and Welfare-Pension Reports indicates that Annan is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Plan, and that Annan leases part of its properties to Giant Food.

All three of the men who Mr. Brown said transferred their stake in Regency to Annan are officers of Giant Food. According to the company's latest annual report, Jacob Lehrman is executive vice president and secretary as well as a director; David B. Sykes is vice president, controller and assistant secretary; Emanuel Cohen is treasurer.

A registration statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on April 3, 1968, indicates that the Giant Food Profit Sharing Plan was set up on January 31, 1953, as a retirement fund "for the benefit of those of its salaried officers and employees who meet certain and minimum employment requirements." On April 26, 1968, its net assets were \$4,752,776. At that time, the total amount accrued under the plan for Mr. Lehrman was \$184,264; for Emanuel Cohen, it was \$184,793.

In his letter to Mayor Washington, Mr. Brown asked that it be made a part of the hearing record. When Barron's looked at the record, however, it was not to be found. We obtained the letter from Mr. Brown.

Hearing officer Fusco noted that several attorneys, including Mr. Brown, questioned the legality of "certain aspects" of the proposal. "Since I am not an attorney," Mr. Fusco told Mayor Washington, "you may want an opinion from your Legal Officer on the legal aspects of the proposal."

Three days later Mayor Washington issued a brief announcement of his approval of the Regency proposal. He said the price of \$2,475,000 was "less expensive than five of the Authority's 10 most recently built or acquired developments containing units for the low-income elderly." He appears to have been wrong on this. He definitely was wrong on another point. He said HUD had reviewed and accepted the proposed purchase price. HUD was unable to approve the price because it was \$125,000 above the highest ap-

praisal; only its regional office had approved the deal.

PRIOR PROMISE

On the day the mayor issued his statement, Mr. Aronov said that in accordance with his prior promises, he was making full disclosure of the Regency deal. He said the acquisition cost was \$2,475,000, to be paid to Murray Levine and Annan Corp.

Noting that questions had been raised about whether NCHA was favoring one person or corporation over others in the purchase of existing buildings, Mr. Aronov said: "Without additional comment the National Capital Housing Authority presents a list of owners or developers of the . . . 10 most recent developments with units for the low-income elderly. In no case has our negotiations or settlement been for more than one property with the same owner or developer."

The list showed that Henry S. Reich was one of the persons from whom NCHA purchased Harvard Towers for \$2,320,000. (Like Regency, it is a high-rise with air conditioning and swimming pool.) Mr. Reich is vice president of Giant Food Properties, Inc. According to the aforementioned statement filed with the SEC, Giant Food "owns approximately 12% of the outstanding shares of Giant Food Properties, Inc. Certain officers and directors of the Company are also officers and directors of Properties, and such officers and directors and their families own approximately 15% of its common stock."

ONE OF ORIGINAL OWNERS

Mr. Reich has a son-in-law named Lee G. Rubinstein, whom Mr. Brown identified as one of the original owners of Regency besides the three aforementioned (but not as an owner at the time of the sale to NCHA). Mr. Rubinstein also was named by Mr. Aronov as one of those from whom NCHA bought Horizon House, another luxury high-rise for \$2,165,000.

Mayor Washington has decided that future housing programs for D.C. should be part of an overall economic development plan. Accordingly, in August of 1968 he established MEDCO—the Mayor's Economic Committee. As chairman, the mayor named Joseph B. Danzanky, president of Giant Food.

Serving as MEDCO's chief economist is Leon Keyserling. While the D.C. government boasts that he once served as chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, it fails to mention that he currently is a member of the board of directors of Giant Food.

Last June MEDCO issued its first report, prepared under the supervision of Dr. Keyserling with a grant from the Economic Development Administration. As part of its goals for the next decade, it called for construction of "about 102,000 new housing units, about half private and half publicly assisted." The study also advocated leased shopping centers (which happen to be a specialty of Giant Food Properties).

DIRECTOR OF PRIDE

MEDCO's staff director is Carroll Harvey, who also is a director of Pride, Inc. Marion Barry, director of program operations for Pride, is listed as a member of MEDCO in its June report, although The Washington Post reported the previous month that he led a protest rally in the city council's chambers and declared, "We have just declared war on the Police Department and this city."

Giant Food, however, gets along with Pride. The firm's latest annual report says proudly: "Giant was the first member of the business community to offer Pride cooperation and support. This cooperation began with assistance in the development of a landscaping training program, and has now been expanded into a commercial landscap-

ing project. Pride is now responsible for landscaping four of Giant's 'beautified' stores and our general offices. Other areas of cooperation are now being explored."

Under the leadership of Mr. Danzanky, Giant Food also helped feed the people burned out of their homes by last year's riots. Later Mr. Danzanky helped feed the residents of Resurrection City here last summer.

ARRANGED FOR DONATIONS

Unquestionably Giant Food's management has done a lot for the D.C. government, and vice versa. Mayor Washington arranged for the donations which made up the \$75,000 difference between the purchase price and the highest appraisal for Regency House. Besides the \$40,000 raised by the Washington (Catholic) Lay Association, other contributions, according to NCHA, included: Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation, \$10,000; New World Foundation, \$5,000; Public Welfare Foundation, \$5,000; Stern Family Fund, \$5,000; Hattie Strong Foundation, \$5,000; and Taconic Foundation, \$5,000.

The contributions, plus a reduction of \$50,000 in the selling price of Regency, made possible the acquisition. Even before the reduction, figuring a price of \$2,475,000, NCHA came up with an average unit cost of \$14,390. It found this was cheaper than unit costs for five other projects for the elderly, and "eminently reasonable."

The Comptroller General, however, found average unit costs of \$16,478 even after the reduction. That's because he counted only the 161 dwelling units, while NCHA included 10 doctors' offices in the basement which will not be used for public housing. Furthermore, NCHA failed to include \$84,500 for rehabilitation costs, \$24,700 for moving expenses for tenants forced out and \$177,179 for NCHA costs. The latter comprises such items as \$8,000 for salaries for nontechnical employees, \$11,501 for technical salaries and \$5,780 for architectural and engineering fees.

Whichever way the unit price is figured, it seems high, since HUD is subject to limitations on room costs contained in section 15 (5) of the Housing Act. Normally it is \$2,400 a room. But in projects designed specifically for the elderly, it is \$3,500 a room. Still, that would seem to bar Regency, which has 77% one-room efficiency apartments. But costs of land and non-dwelling units may be excluded, and HUD counts the bathroom and kitchen efficiencies, thus coming up with three rooms.

Mr. Staats explained, "Under HUD procedures, a project is considered to be specifically designed for the elderly if it is designated by HUD as a project for the elderly, and at least 60% of all dwelling units are efficiencies and not more than 4% of the units have two bedrooms."

ELDERLY DESIGNATION

The government put grab bars in the bathrooms at Regency and gave it the elderly designation. (The aforementioned Horizon House and Harvard Towers also are designated for the elderly.) While NCHA counted 174 units in figuring costs of acquiring public housing, Horizon actually has only 106 apartments. The rest of the units have been converted to serve as the headquarters for NCHA.

Though the Authority seems adept at acquiring luxury high-rises, its expertise does not seem to extend to taking adequate care of some of the more traditional projects it owns. Local papers reported recently that tenants at the Frederick Douglass Public Housing Project here are complaining of rats, termites, ceilings falling in, doors and windows without screens or locks and apartments that have not been painted for six years.

EASING RACIAL TENSION THROUGH RACIAL BALANCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, if busing of schoolchildren across town or about a county is a desirable means of attaining social justice, surely it is just as desirable to bus children from State to State—or for that matter, to transport families from area to area. The only difference between across town or State to State is the distance involved which certainly cannot be a moral consideration in attaining social justice and relieving racial tensions by achieving racial balance—if the promoters are truly in good faith.

For this reason, I have introduced House Resolution 497 to establish a committee "to conduct a full and complete study of the demography of the United States with a view toward providing relief from racial tensions by more equal distribution of underprivileged racial groups throughout the several States and in the political subdivisions of each State."

To any student of contemporary America, especially those dedicated to a fully integrated society, it is generally known that Negroes comprise 11 percent of our national population. Yet, in some sections of our country, the Negro population exceeds 50 percent and even extends to 80 percent. Attaining social justice in these heavily impacted areas is a much more difficult task than in other locations which are under the 11 percent national average.

Castigating or villifying the people and community in the heavily impacted areas only incites additional racial tensions and is not a solution but aggravates the problem. My bill would propose a study to determine the equal distribution of the underprivileged minorities about our country. House Resolution 497 would, first, help ease the ever-increasing racial tensions and, second, give more of our fellow countrymen an equal opportunity to work together to help solve the seriously worsening underprivileged minorities problem in our country.

I invite all my fellow colleagues, especially those who have already approved of using busing and denial of freedom to achieve racial balance, to join with me in cosponsoring similar legislation.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 497 follows:

H. RES. 497

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Not more than five members of the committee shall be members of the same political party. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the demography of the United States with the

view toward providing relief from racial tensions by more equal distribution of underprivileged racial groups throughout the several States and in the political subdivisions of each State.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

A CALL TO ACTION

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned last week, our merchant marine fleet is in dire need of rejuvenation. We can no longer ignore this call to action.

I would like to bring the following brochure, published by the Labor-Management Maritime Committee, to the attention of my colleagues. This brochure outlines what must be done to improve the stance of the merchant marine fleet.

The brochure follows:

MARITIME PROGRAM IMPERATIVES—A TIME FOR "DEEDS—NOT WORDS"

Throughout the current decade, the maritime industry has been "studied to death." The approach to each major problem has been: Appoint another committee—conduct another study—initiate another survey. These are the convenient tools of those whose end purpose is to do nothing or who seek to delay what must be done. It may already be later than we think to get on with the job of building an overall balanced merchant marine. This publication not only calls for an end to wasteful delay but sets forth a formula for meeting urgent maritime program needs. President Nixon has called for a strong U.S.-flag merchant marine. We strongly support him in his efforts to achieve this worthy objective.

A TENACIOUS TALKATHON

"Let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto Heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." Genesis 11:4.

An Executive Order dated June 17, 1964, established the President's Maritime Advisory Committee (MAC). It included the best maritime minds in the nation.

With commendable unanimity, this high level committee sought to build "a tower" of maritime strength and again "make us a name" among the sea powers of the world.

Much of our merchant fleet had already been "scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth" by a loose foreign transfer policy.

On November 27, 1965, following months of strenuous effort, the Committee concluded its task and submitted its report to the President. Regrettably, it was ignored and relegated to the "archives."

Thus this meritorious effort became engulfed in the same tenacious talkathon that has plagued our merchant fleet for two decades.

Nor does it stand alone in this respect. Other pronouncements of undoubted good intention met the same fate.

In 1944 President Eisenhower said, "America's industrial prosperity and military security both demand that we maintain a privately operated merchant marine adequate in size and of modern design to insure that our lines of supply for either peace or war will be safe."¹ This worthy aim and purpose has been appreciably forgotten.

President Kennedy declared on October 3, 1960, that "our defense must be second to none, our merchant marine at full strength, our commitment to the world's people clear and unmistakable."² Nothing remotely resembling "full strength" was ever accomplished.

President Johnson stated on January 16, 1964, "A strong merchant marine is a guarantee of national security and economic stability."³ Nothing was done to help the merchant marine guarantee it.

Again, on January 4, 1965, he declared, "I will recommend heavier reliance on competition in transportation and a new policy for our merchant marine."⁴ Nothing worthy of the name was ever recommended.

On March 19, 1969, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, sought an end to words without deeds when he said:

"We have had promises from the Administration and past administrations that we would get a new Navy and a new Merchant Marine. The time has come for more than words. As President Nixon said, 'I believe that it is far more effective to use deeds rather than words... in order to accomplish objectives'. Words have been used up till now. Mr. President, we are waiting for some deeds."⁵

Congressman Rivers' call for an end to this tenacious talkathon should be heeded without delay. The gap between pronouncement and performance must be bridged.

THE DIMENSION OF MARITIME DIVISIVENESS

"Let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." Genesis 11:7.

October 4, 1965, is remorsefully known as our maritime "day of infamy".

On that day came the abrupt revelation that the Administration—while purporting to confer openly with the "maritime industry"—had simultaneously and with concealed ambidexterity, produced the now infamous Intergency Maritime Task Force Report. The whole maritime industry was stunned.

With unfathomable shock and chagrin, the President's Maritime Advisory Committee struggled on through the few ensuing days of its life and concluded its report.

Quickly shelving the MAC recommendations, the Intergency Maritime Task Force extolled the virtues of its own report in every major seaport of the nation.

¹ President Eisenhower in London, 1944.

² Speech at convention of National Maritime Union, New York City, October 3, 1960.

³ Remarks in connection with keel laying of SS "Louise Lykes" on January 16, 1964.

⁴ State of Union Message, January 4, 1965.

⁵ Address before Propeller Club of the U.S., Port of Washington, D.C., March 19, 1969.

However, this atrocious maritime deformity, spawned in the shadows of administrative secrecy, could not long endure the light of day.

Over a 20-year period—1966 to 1985 (inclusive)—it proposed to:

Reduce our present small commercial fleets by 185 ships.

Accomplish such fleet reduction during periods of enormous foreign trade expansion.

Reduce annual government support by over \$25 million.

Confine U.S. shipyard construction to a static 21 commercial ships annually.

Open the floodgates to extensive foreign construction of U.S.-flag ships.

Reduce shipboard employment by 20,465 jobs.

Change national policy to support only a "lean trade leverage" fleet.

Place the nation's commerce at the mercy of foreign shipping.

The principal result of such a monstrosity was to beget massive maritime divisiveness.

Thus were sown the thorns of division that choked out the seeds of unity.

This is not to say that divisiveness had not existed—labor vs. labor; management vs. management, or both against each other.

However, in the MAC deliberations, all joined together to achieve maximum maritime capability. The Intergency Task Force neutralized these meritorious efforts, creating a Tower of Babel fiasco from which the maritime community even yet has not emerged.

To those who desired unlimited foreign ship construction, the turnstile was opened wide.

To American capital with expansive foreign-flag operations, the Task Force Report gave sanctity and support.

To those with obsolete World War II fleets, vague experimental subsidy proposals evoked dubious hope.

To maritime labor, already divided, it engendered even greater proliferation in desperation for realistic long-term employment security.

The bureaucratic gods of the Intergency Maritime Task Force truly came down "to confuse their language".

Subsequently, a multi-lingualism of massive proportions has beset the maritime community, engulfing government, labor, and management.

The Nation awaits a new dawn of maritime consciousness. It is fervently hoped that this dawning will not be too late.

Government cannot evade vital maritime issues by a pronouncement that nothing will be done until industry is united. Government helped divide it.

Carriers of waterborne commerce cannot expect maximum effort from government while their leaders pursue further separative purpose.

Maritime labor cannot expect favorable action to reverse the decline in merchant shipping while their ranks continue a divisive course.

Perhaps the whole maritime community cannot reunite. God forbid! for it will most certainly bring grief to the nation.

A reappraisal of our maritime needs with an acceptable program for meeting national maritime objectives is imperative.

The Labor-Management Maritime Committee believes the following condensed formula is conducive to a responsible maritime program. It invites consideration by all who hope for a rebuilding of U.S.-flag merchant shipping.

BASIC CONCEPTS FOR STRENGTHENING THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE

General policy imperatives

Support and sustain the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 as the national instrument of maritime policy, amending it cautiously

where the lessons of time and experience clearly mandate.

Reaffirm the valid and time-tested concept that a strong U.S.-Flag Merchant Marine is essential to both the commercial well-being and national security of the Nation.

Develop constructive means for transporting a "substantial portion" of our export-import commerce in U.S.-flag ships and aggressively pursue the declared objective of "at least 50%" as a national goal.

Provide more realistic consideration of U.S. merchant seapower in future military and defense planning.

Adopt an overall Merchant Marine program sufficiently capable of meeting foreign competition from any source including the ever-growing challenge of the communist bloc.

Achieve to the highest attainable degree an American Merchant Marine owned and operated under the United States Flag by citizens of the United States, composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels constructed in the United States, manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel.

Essential trade routes

Support the principle of essential trade routes over which regular and dependable shipping services are mandated.

Provide (1) flexible adjustment in maximum and minimum sailings, (2) facility in modifying ports of call, and (3) broader trade route determinations based upon ultimate intermodal destinations and responsive to changing conditions.

Promote adaptability of shipping service to excessive traffic or peak load conditions on the respective sea lanes by approval of cross-chartering between operators.

Simplify procedures under Section 605(c) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to facilitate determinations for expanded U.S.-flag service.

The steamship conference system

Encourage the operation of ocean freight conferences under the shipping act of 1916 to promote rate stability and avoid costly rate wars by further strengthening the operational aspects of rate agreements.

Provide dependable services to exporters and importers through maximum self regulation by the maritime industry.

Sustain the concept that complete regulatory surveillance by government in the public interest should continue to be lodged with the Federal Maritime Commission as the proper guardian of the Shipping Act of 1916.

Support the dual rate contract system as a common and proper business practice which can provide constructive assistance in meeting the objectives of the 1916 act with properly administered safeguards against possible abuses.

Cargo preference

Equate foreign and domestic costs through (1) maximum competitive ship capability and (2) operating support for the remaining cost differential gap.

Retain and strengthen cargo preference (after equating costs) to achieve "routing preference" only—thus offsetting similar preferential routing practices by competing foreign maritime nations.

Mandate the positive and effective application of cargo preference laws by responsible government agencies, concentrating overall supervision in one centralized authority—The Maritime Administration.

Operating subsidy contracts

Unburden the authority to contract from the unorthodox administrative controls superimposed by Reorganization Plan No. 7.

Promote greater flexibility in the exercise of the contracting authority under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 without impediment from other governmental sources.

Call upon the executive and legislative branches of government to implement and

make effective the legally authorized contracts of the constituted quasi-judicial maritime authority.

The parity principle

Maintain the cost equalization of parity concept of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in both the operating and construction areas of world competition.

Acknowledge existing incentives for diminishing the differential cost gap in each area of competition and strive for additional incentives with effective application.

Correctly identify and apply full parity between foreign and American costs. Eliminate current government practices designed to dilute the payment of fully equalized operating cost differentials to contracting lines.

Simplify the current cumbersome and laborious methods of computing cost differentials, thus eliminating traditional backlogs in accounts due to the operators, making certain that the applications of new systems do not violate the parity concept itself nor impair its basic realization in practice.

Recognize that reductions in differential gaps between U.S. and foreign costs may be possible through achieving higher relative competitive capability but that elimination of such differentials assumes the improbable: (1) lack of corresponding foreign maritime competitive progress and (2) equalization of world-wide standards of living and wages.

Merchant shipbuilding

Adopt a merchant ship construction program ranging from 30 to 40 ships a year designed to provide appropriate allotment between liner, dry bulk and liquid bulk carriers based upon demand.

Support the maximization of merchant shipbuilding in U.S. yards with shipyard subsidy adequate to meet this purpose.

Sustain the principle that the United States must have an adequate shipbuilding capacity and an adequate nucleus of skilled shipbuilders to meet peacetime emergency needs.

Oppose any proposal that this Nation take advantage of sweatshop standards in backward countries to build ships for the commerce of the United States.

Support the construction or purchase of ships abroad with full U.S. flag operating privileges *only when* American shipyard facilities are unavailable or when ship replacements will be denied or seriously impeded due to lack of government financing.

Keep pace with other nations by adopting an adequate and continuous planning and research program designed to attain the highest competitive ability through modernization of plant facilities and the promotion of technological advancement.

Separate support for U.S. shipyards

View shipbuilding in the United States as a distinct industry separate and apart from the operating Merchant Marine.

Provide necessary government subsidy directly to the shipyards.

Provide direct federal support for research and development programs dealing with construction practices and management systems specifically designed to promote efficiency, productivity, and the ability to meet world-wide competition.

The national defense reserve fleet

Accept the fact that the National Defense Reserve Fleet as we have known it, is the remnant of an age that has passed and do not overburden the future with it.

Pursue an active scrapping program for all ships deemed unusable for military purposes.

Oppose the upgrading of AP-2, AP-3, and similar World War II vessels in the reserve fleet; subjecting them only to the normal preservation processes and applying cost savings to the construction of new privately-owned merchant ships.

Upgrade the reserve fleet by accelerating the retirement of C-2 and C-3 or even su-

perior vessels from the current operating fleet.

Concentrate on new ship construction to produce ready and available operating ships for defense purposes.

American owned foreign-flag ships

Recognize the weakness of the "effective control" policy as a means of insuring availability of American owned foreign-flag ships in a national emergency.

Re-evaluate the Department of Defense position that "effective control" ships constitute a dependable national asset.

Stop the exodus of U.S. merchant ships to foreign-flag and encourage their return to U.S. registry by re-designing government policy to achieve a climate conducive to capital investment and competitive operational stability.

Financing a merchant marine program

Provide continuity of available Government funds to implement our national maritime policy through the instrumentality of a maritime revolving fund.

Institute a maritime revolving fund for both ship operation and construction purposes in a manner similar to the former construction fund provided under Section 206 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

In addition to the fund sources provided under this provision of law, consider the continuous replenishing of such revolving fund by annual transfers from customs receipts.

Predetermine an appropriate amount to meet the government's share of essential operating and construction costs necessary to effectively implement our national maritime policy, increasing customs duties if necessary to accomplish this purpose.

Make transfers from customs receipts as well as expenditures from the maritime revolving fund, conditioned upon annual program consideration by the Congress and appropriate action by the respective appropriation committees.

By such method, eliminate budget inadequacies contributing to our current unenviable position in world shipping.

Berth line carriers

Process the long delayed and unprocessed applications of berth lines for cost parity contracts under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act.

Provide operating subsidy to such lines without unfair advantage over existing subsidized carriers and with reasonable dispatch, wherever the provisions of 1936 are adequately met.

Provide for fleet replacement, within a reasonable period, under the same limitations and obligations now assumed by existing Berth Line carriers under subsidy contract.

Require as a condition to receiving cost parity operating support that all companies involved subject themselves to the normal regulations applicable to existing subsidy contract lines and divest themselves of foreign-flag operations.

Dry bulk carriers

Provide cost parity with foreign operators by extending operating differential subsidy to dry bulk carriers similar to that enjoyed by the Berth Lines, wherever practical. Require such carriers to eliminate equivalent foreign-flag tonnage to the extent possessed and guarantee no subsequent increase in such tonnage thus leading to its ultimate retirement. Amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to facilitate this purpose.

Provide long-term operating contracts for qualified dry bulk carriers with provision for vessel replacement and with worldwide trading privileges.

Phase out rate differentials in transporting government supported bulk cargoes as new vessels are constructed and placed into service with appropriate timing to protect existing operators in the trade with Title XI or other financial obligations to meet.

Terminate the purely administrative practice of denying to bulk carriers the shipyard construction support authorized under the 1936 Merchant Marine Act.

Standardize to the fullest practical extent the design of bulk cargo vessels to achieve the lowest possible construction cost without sacrificing productivity and efficiency in world market competition.

Establish an interim goal for carrying 30% of our dry bulk export-import cargo in U.S. flag ships and strive for an ultimate goal in excess of 50%.

Modify the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to provide capital reserve and/or special reserve privileges similar to those enjoyed by the current subsidy contract Berth Lines. Extend this latter provision to Great Lakes shipping as well.

Liquid bulk carriers

Re-design shipping policy to encourage American owned liquid bulk carriers engaged in U.S. foreign commerce to operate under U.S. flag.

Pursue the goal of transporting at least 30% of our liquid bulk cargo in U.S. flag tankers.

Seek voluntary action by liquid bulk proprietary companies to return their foreign-flag ships to U.S. registry and program future replacement ships for U.S.-flag operation.

Upon failure of voluntary means to achieve results, mandate the imposition of a minimum import quota in order to reach desired goals.

Inland water carriers

Repeal the no-mixing rule for inland barge lines so that large volume tows may continue to be operated and low rates for shippers preserved.

Advance the replacement of obsolete equipment through provision for equipment trust arrangements. Support legislation for recording trust agreements and evidences of equipment indebtedness with the Interstate Commerce Commission for all types of water carriers.

Oppose waterway or user charges on inland waterways.

Domestic commerce

Provide a realistic depreciation policy to stimulate investment capital for domestic commerce.

Grant to domestic carriers the right to deposit a portion of earnings before taxes in a special reserve fund for purposes of ship construction, reconstruction or alteration as in the case of subsidized operators. Amend Section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to accomplish this purpose.

Appropriate lodging of government maritime functions

Accept the principle that a positive merchant marine program is the preeminent and overriding consideration—not the lodging of maritime functions within government.

Lodge the Maritime Administration where deemed most appropriate but assign to it broad authority for carrying out our national maritime laws and policies.

Pursue the goal of transporting at least 30% of our liquid bulk cargo in U.S. flag tankers.

United States Senate—clothed with appropriate authority and responsibility for administering maritime programs unfettered by pyramiding echelons of multiple supervision and control and with independent action on all matters requiring hearings and/or public notice.

Establish a civil maritime board with independent authority (either within or outside a department), appointed by the President with confirmation by the United States Senate—to perform promotional and quasi-judicial functions. If within a department, provide an appeal either to the secretary or directly to the courts as in the case of an independent agency.

Passenger ships

Promote continued passenger ship operation under U.S.-flag.

Eliminate restrictions on sale or other means of disposal of unprofitable passenger ships upon proven economic non-feasibility for continued operation.

Construct new passenger ships of the size, type, and design required for modern passenger traffic especially keyed to the cruise trade.

Apply the sole recourse provision of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to all new passenger ships.

Support merger of passenger ship operations on a broad consolidated company basis if required to keep U.S.-flag passenger ships on the high seas.

Labor-management relations

Strive to achieve continuity of service to shippers and the general public without interruption by labor-management disputes.

Support government action to stem the ever-spiraling cost of living and corresponding wage depletion so damaging to maritime work stability.

Establish a system for handling labor-management disputes intrinsically conducive to timely settlement—failure of which penalizes only the disputants.

Provide for continuing review of incentives conducive to equitable and effective avoidance of work stoppages.

Seek proper wages for corresponding job assignment without inter-union "me-tooism" which has plagued the maritime industry.

Promote a realistic recognition on the part of all segments of the maritime industry that unnecessary work stoppages have already wrought great damage and can ultimately destroy it.

Appoint a high level committee of union and management representatives to develop realistic means of achieving these ends.

The Labor-Management Maritime Committee has set forth in this brochure the key imperatives for achieving a strong U.S.-flag merchant fleet. We feel that most segments of the American Merchant Marine will preponderantly agree with the proposals set forth. Where there is disagreement, there will undoubtedly be areas of compromise. Where patently unsound proposals are advanced, or where unwarranted attacks are made upon the Merchant Marine Act and those operating under it we shall oppose them. We call upon all segments of the industry, both labor and management, to assist the President and the Congress in the job of restoring a major share of our commerce to U.S.-flag shipping and in building a merchant marine capable of transporting it.

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE SPEAKS OUT ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to place in the RECORD the national affairs platform and resolutions of the American Veterans Committee.

This outstanding, liberal veterans' organization consistently supports progressive policies for our Nation. Their slogan, "citizens first, veterans second," reflects their desire to work on behalf of the Nation as a whole and all of its people rather than just for special privileges for veterans.

I commend this excellent statement to my colleagues, as follows:

NATIONAL AFFAIRS PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

AVC stands for the Bill of Rights as a living force animating the political life of our Nation and as a firm limitation on the arbitrariness of government.

AVC stands for the Bill of Rights as a guarantee of our freedom to speak, to assemble, to believe, and to dissent without fear from the conformities of the day.

AVC stands for equality for all, regardless of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex or age, and for the constitutional guarantees of such equality.

AVC stands for just legislative representation of the people of the United States, the States and their subdivisions, without poll taxes or other property qualifications for voting, with equal weight for each vote, and on a geographically fair basis, within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

AVC stands for a policy of gainful, full employment and security for all, as outlined in the Employment Act of 1946.

AVC stands for responsible, efficient, and honest government and for the merit system in government employment.

AVC stands for a government possessing and willing to exercise all powers necessary to bring about a solution of our national problems.

AVC supports the active intervention of government, primarily of the Federal Government, in the economy and the general welfare of our country to stimulate and provide employment to improve the physical condition of our cities and towns, of our housing and our schools, to bring all the greatest benefits from the development and conservation of our natural and industrial resources and to provide for the general welfare and health of our country to stimulate and provide employment to improve the physical condition of our cities and towns, of our housing and our schools, to bring all the greatest benefits from the development and conservation of our natural and industrial resources and to provide for the general welfare and health of our people.

AVC supports a tax policy based on ability to pay and opposes regressive sales and excise taxes.

AVC stands for the recognition of equal rights for labor and management and for improved social benefits of employees.

AVC supports an educational system and a public health system which will give the American people, and America's youth in particular, the knowledge, skills, and training, and the physical and mental health and stamina, to continue their forward march toward America's democratic fulfillment.

GOVERNMENT AND LIBERTY

I. The Nation's freedom—The Bill of Rights

1. We affirm the basic right of all Americans to due process of law, the right to counsel and to freedom from unlawful search and seizure. We oppose all efforts to suppress freedoms to believe, speak, write, assemble, criticize, and dissent.

2. A. We urge strong and consistent enforcement of existing laws and regulations which will insure to the citizens of the United States and of the several States the full measure of their privileges and immunities of due process of law and the equal protection of the laws guaranteed to them by the Constitution, regardless of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion or sex, or wage, and urge the national, state and local governments to enact such further laws, ordinances and regulations as may be needed further to insure these ends.

B. We believe in the principles of the separation of church and state.

C. We favor freedom from censorship of newspapers, magazines, radio, television, motion pictures and other media by the Post Office, Customs Bureau, police departments, and other units of government as well as by private pressure groups.

D. We oppose the use of wiretapping and electronic and other forms of eavesdropping devices whether by private individuals or Government officials, elected or appointed.

E. We urge protection by Federal law of all members of the Armed Forces from physical violence because of race, color, ancestry, national origin or religion.

F. We urge making lynching a Federal crime, as well as making provisions for compensation to the families of lynching victims.

G. We favor Federal legislation making it a crime to bomb or to conspire to bomb school, church and other public and quasi-public property.

3. A. The right against self-incrimination. No inference should be drawn in regard to guilt in any legal proceeding of any person solely because he exercises this right.

B. The right to travel. The right of an American citizen to travel abroad should not be arbitrarily abridged by the Federal Government.

II. The Nation's Government

1. Freedom of information: The right of the people to full knowledge of government affairs must not be abridged, except where disclosure would imperil the national security or where disclosure would, without substantial public benefit, encroach on the right of the individual to personal liberty or freedom.

2. Congress: We urge proper changes in the rules of the Congress of the United States which will make it possible for the majority of the members to vote cloture or close debate on legislation after a reasonable period, and which will make merit, not tenure alone, the standard to be used in the selection of committee chairmen.

3. Federal-State Relations: We favor strict Federal standard-setting and enforcement in all federal grants in aid.

4. State and local government: We urge reapportionment within the States consistent with the principle "one man-one vote."

5. The Federal civil service:

A. Apart from discharges based on reorganization of Government activities or reduction in force, Government employees should be discharged only for cause and through due process of law. The employees should be presented with a written statement of charges, have the right to a hearing before an impartial board. He should have the right to present evidence, be confronted with adverse witnesses, cross-examine witnesses, and receive a transcript of the hearing free of charge. Action toward his separation from the Government service should be taken only on the basis thus made.

B. The rights granted to veterans in the Veterans Preference Act in regard to discharge procedures and appeals should be extended to all Government employees except those in probationary status.

6. District of Columbia: We urge that the District of Columbia receive, by legislation or by constitutional amendment where the matter cannot be handled by legislation:

A. The right to local self-government and; B. The right to elect Senators and Representatives in Congress;

C. An equitable annual Federal contribution in lieu of taxes.

ECONOMIC SECURITY

III. Basic economic policy

1. We continue to support the Employment Act of 1946 which states it is the policy of the Government to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities in-

cluding self-employment for those able, willing and seeking to work and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

2. To insure the interest of the consumer we urge Congress to establish a Department of the Consumer, to be headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank.

IV. Monetary policy and tax policy

1. Monetary policy:

We urge the establishment of a Federal capital budget for reimbursable public works appropriations and to improve the accounting and budgetary operations of the Government.

2. Tax policy:

A. We urge elimination of special provisions in the internal revenue laws which are discriminatory in nature. As blatant examples, we point to the favored tax treatment of the extractive industries, the restricted stock options for corporate executives, the retirement income credit, the preferred tax treatment of profits on stock market transactions, and the dividend exclusion and credit provision.

B. We also call for an end to the abuse of the deductibility of business expenses to finance luxurious travel, vacations, and entertainment for business management, professional men and sales executives.

V. The urban crisis

AVC from its inception has been vitally concerned about the urban crisis, and we recognize the urgency of effective action to overcome the conditions which have caused it. These are many-faceted, including a shortage of jobs, of homes, of services, of educational incentives, of recreational opportunities. They also include environmental pollution and the citizen's increasing inability to influence or even participate in city government by democratic means. Many of these evils are most concentrated in the slums.

The concept embodied in the Model Cities program of strengthening local government and the people it serves to solve these problems, offers a sensible approach to solution of the urban crisis itself. AVC urges expansion of this demonstration program to all communities which may benefit from it, with adequate financing for both the development of local plans and the federal programs which are expected to contribute to their implementation. We intend to be vigilant that the focus remains, under the new program guidelines, on the disadvantaged in the cities.

Citizen participation in the planning and administration, as provided for in Model cities, Community Action and other programs, is the democratic means of assuring that resources intended to help the disadvantaged are not bargained away without the consent, or at least the understanding, of the poor themselves. We urge the Congress to retain its requirements for citizen participation and extend them to additional programs which the federal government supports. We urge also that provision be made and funds be allocated for independent planning staff and facilities for citizens' groups and commissions.

An important aspect of the urban crisis is housing. Physical reclamation of the slums requires the provision of housing for those who now inhabit the slums, at rents or prices which are fair and which they can afford to pay. To bring this about, we favor flexible use and adequate funding of the variety of programs now in use, including rent supplements, eased purchase credit, reduced interest costs. We also recognize that it will be some time before the private housing industry will be able to play a significant role in such low-return activities, and we therefore call for the widest variety of public investments in housing, such as traditional

public housing, turnkey housing direct interest-free loans and leased housing. And we need serious thought about new approaches.

Beyond the creation of the necessary housing, our government must assure that access to housing is assured regardless of the race, color, creed, national origin, age or size of family of the prospective user. We call for vigorous enforcement of the Fair Housing provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which was a start toward elimination of the ghettos.

We also recognize that the urban crisis is affected by the rural crisis which has long been apparent but ignored. We therefore demand that the scantily-funded rural counterpart programs be revitalized and used toward stabilizing the life of our rural citizens in the countryside where they prefer to live instead of forcing them to migrate to the cities, often to be engulfed by the slums.

VI. Conservation and development of natural resources

We accept as a cardinal principle of conservation policy that the natural resources of this land are given to us in trust for the people of this and subsequent generations. The benefits of these resources must be distributed widely and equitably and a share thereof must be preserved for future citizens.

Through comprehensive and coordinated national and regional planning and development, wise use, and enlightened conservation, this can be done. The very nature of the problem requires that Government play a major and controlling role in assuring that conservation.

1. Department of Natural Resources. We propose the organization of the Department of Natural Resources. Such a new department should provide for regionally decentralized opportunities for program formulation and execution, while clearly placing federal responsibility for resources development within the framework of a single agency. The regional multi-purpose concept may require that specific localities or projects be reserved or developed for one or more preferred uses.

2. Water and Air Conservation:

A. We reaffirm our strong support of comprehensive multi-purpose river basin development and urge the accelerated application of this principle to our river basins.

B. We similarly favor regional planning by the States and metropolitan areas as well as area redevelopment.

C. We urge the Federal Government to undertake the planning and construction of multi-purpose water and power projects similar to the one provided in the Tennessee Valley. Their very scope requires government development and precludes the short-term, piecemeal operations of private interests.

D. The conservation and development of adequate fresh water supplies to meet expanding needs for domestic agricultural, industrial, wildlife and recreational uses, and the protection and improvement of water quality, especially in relation to accumulated pesticides and other contaminating matters, are of increasingly urgent concern.

3. Energy resources conservation. We call for:

A. The maximum feasible development of our only renewable energy resource hydroelectric power including Federal construction of multi-purpose power dams and other waterpower, irrigation, flood control and navigation works using standards of feasibility and repayment schedules for such projects based upon their reasonably expected service life.

B. A continuation and acceleration of the Federal programs to develop and stimulate development of effective processes for the utilization of our immense reserves of oil, natural gas, shale and coal.

C. We urge a major increase in the scope and speed of air pollution prevention measures.

D. The development of atomic energy (both fission and fusion type) for power and other peaceful purposes.

4. Recreation and Wildlife:

The expansion in the demands for outdoor recreation opportunities requires that we add to our national park system and increase the recreational developments of our national forests, public lands, reservoirs and seashores.

We endorse legislation to control billboard erection in scenic areas. Urban planning and redevelopment should include provision for open spaces and outdoor recreation areas.

5. National Land Reserve.

We support the concept that our remaining public lands constitute a "National Land Reserve" to be administered for the benefit of the public with appropriate safeguards for future generations.

6. Pesticide Control

We urge careful consideration and close supervision of pest control programs in recreational, farming, and urban areas.

VII. Agriculture

American agriculture is increasingly the victim of the owners of the new machines, themselves investors rather than farmers. Hired workers are displaced from jobs, and farm lands are being concentrated in fewer hands as farmers themselves are displaced.

AVC calls for a four-part approach to the resulting problems:

1. A reduction of subsidies to industrialized agriculture, those now being paid in proportion to production or for practices which, like some in other industries, are a normal part of the business;

2. New approaches to two problems of the sub-marginal farmer and the farm laborer, recognizing that their plight is closely related to that of the underemployed urban worker and is only in part agricultural.

3. Strengthening the economic family farm through greater attention to credit, service and marketing needs;

4. Providing for rural people the whole range of educational, cultural, recreational, health and other opportunities already accessible to dwellers in metropolitan areas.

VIII. Labor

We urge:

1. Periodic updating of the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to insure the coverage of maximum numbers of categories of workers and a realistic and decent Federal minimum wage.

2. Enactment of laws for the full disclosure of the administration of pension and health and welfare plans, whether administered by unions or management or jointly by both. Federal law should follow existing Federal securities legislation and State laws such as that of the State of New York for the exemptions contained in the latter.

IX. Social welfare

As veterans concerned with the social welfare of all citizens we urge:

1. Federal standards to increase unemployment insurance benefits, more realistic eligibility standards and lengthening of the period for which benefits are paid.

2. Development of a strong and unified child welfare program with the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

3. Development of Federal services and grants-in-aid for the prevention and control of narcotics addiction, based on the promise that drug addiction is a disease to be treated.

X. Education

1. We recognize that "In the quality of education lies the fate of freedom itself." We urge the provision of educational opportunity for every American to the limits of his capacity, and the identification of the talented

among us in order to challenge them to their highest achievement.

2. To improve and extend existing scholarship and loan programs for college and university students.

3. To extend scholarship and exchange programs for study by Americans abroad and by nationals of other countries in the United States.

4. To appropriate adequate Federal aid to communities impacted by Federal programs.

5. We oppose the use of public funds whether as grants or loans to non-public elementary and secondary schools.

XI. Public health

We urge:

1. Increased Federal expenditures for research in the prevention and care of illness.

2. Expansion of medical insurance and group medical care plans, including a plan for national health insurance.

3. Expansion of public health facilities and services hospitals and nursing homes, without regard to race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion or sex.

XII. Indian rights

We oppose revocation of commitments entered into by treaty between the U.S. Government or the Government of any state and the various Indian tribes.

We support all efforts (1) to safeguard Indian lands and resources from exploitation and expropriation in violation of treaty rights and (2) to make the Indian tribes capable of supporting themselves from the proper development of their resources.

We support adequate health and educational services for the Indian tribes capable of supporting themselves from the proper development of their resources. We support adequate health and educational services for the Indian reservation as well as training in modern industrial and management skills to enhance the opportunities for better living and the ability of the Indian tribes to manage their own affairs.

We also support social services to those Indians who desire to live outside their tribal reservations so as to assist them in adapting themselves especially to urban living and to protect them against discrimination and hostility in their new environment.

RESOLUTION ON VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

AVC wholeheartedly endorses the extension of the voting rights legislation now in effect and slated to expire in 1970. In AVC's view, this legislation should be made permanent. But if this is not feasible, it should be extended for at least ten years rather than the five years now proposed. The extended legislation should uphold clearly existing bans on literacy and other special tests for voter qualification. In particular, it should not lessen existing provisions for their prohibition in the guise of making them applicable nationwide. The extent of state- or even county- or city-wide voter registration or actual voting is not a guaranty against vexatious state laws directed against participation in voting by segments of the voting population.

RESOLUTION ON TAX REFORM

I

AVC in its platform has called for tax reform; that is, the abolition of favored treatment of numerous types of business transactions and of the exemptions of broad classes of income from the burden of income taxation. The tax reform is NOT, however, the imposition of a token tax on a small group of very wealthy taxpayers whom the law presently enables to avoid all taxes or the repeal of the income tax which now hits some very small net income earners. If, as the Nixon Administration proposes, only these two steps were taken, it would be in effect a refusal to bring fundamental justice

to our tax system. Even within this framework the Administration proposals reduce the proposed tax bite from the income of the very rich from \$420,000,000 in earlier proposals to only \$80,000,000 in their own current project and narrow relief for low income taxpayers to the very lowest group which pays minimal income tax in any event, and pays taxes primarily through sales taxes which some Administration leaders seem to favor on a nationwide scale under the guise of a "value added" tax. This reshuffling of income taxes would help the very low income earners very little and would certainly not relieve seriously their poverty. To this end, welfare policies must be revamped as we propose in a separate resolution. It is our hope that Congress, sensing the mood of taxpayers, will take the bit in its mouth and enact a program which will reshape our income tax to make it a fair instrument to raise the funds needed to finance national programs.

II

The areas of favored income and transactions are today well known in their broad outlines to lay taxpayer and tax specialist alike. In general, in these areas, tax reform means the removal of the tax favored treatment. If some situations require special formulae, these would not be in the nature of exemption, but of defining the application of the general principles imposing the income tax to particular sets of business facts.

The major classes of income which should be made fully taxable are:

1. Interest from tax-exempt state and local bonds, including industrial development bonds.

2. Capital gains, including unrealized capital gains on assets passing on their owner's death to his heirs or as the principal of a trust upon the death of life tenant to the remaindermen.

3. Income from oil and gas properties and rights and other mineral and natural resources through application of depletion allowances.

Arrangements which should not give rise to tax-favored treatment include:

1. Stock options for corporate executives.

2. The splitting of a single business into multiple corporations to escape in part the surtax on corporate income.

3. Unlimited charitable contributions.

4. Charitable contributions of appreciated property.

5. Real estate transactions involving accelerated depreciation and other "tax-shelter" devices.

6. Interest paid on funds borrowed for certain types of bond purchases.

7. Farms operated primarily for loss deduction purposes by individuals and corporations engaged in non-farm callings or professions.

It has been estimated that the annual tax loss to the U.S. Treasury Department from the tax-favored treatment of these and other classes of income and transactions exceeds \$20 billion at present tax rates. Obviously, many social programs for the relief of poverty and discrimination, for the improvement of housing and of our environment, and for the advancement of science and education could be financed and, in addition, relief be given to the lower and middle-bracket taxpayer.

III

The business activities and investments of charitable and educational and religious institutions, including private foundations, have grown to such an extent that the burden on other taxpayers of the exemptions from income tax which their income from these sources largely enjoys, is seriously called into question. We endorse proposals to subject their income to taxation at a special lower rate, which recognizes implicitly the public benefit judged to flow from their activities.

We warn, however, against the misuse of the need for reform in this area, as well as in the area of self-dealing and personal benefit between foundations and their founders, to impose upon foundations restrictions on the choice of their activities which reflect political prejudices of congressional majorities and bar them from innovative social projects which could not be undertaken without foundation support for the benefit of the American people.

IV

We urge immediate repeal of the investment credit provision in order to help stem present inflationary pressures.

RESOLUTION ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

AVC expresses its grave concern over the recent actions of the Department of Defense in the handling of its Equal Employment Opportunity Program for Defense Contractors. The return to a practice of direct informal dealings between high Department of Defense officials and top officials of defense contractors, which in the past has proved barren of results in promoting effectively equal employment opportunities has seriously impaired the usefulness of this program. Such direct dealing not only in effect grants immunity for past violations and from regular enforcement procedures but also demoralizes the administrative staffs within the Department of Defense and of Labor charged with the administration of the program. For they find themselves by-passed and their authority undermined. Only a return to strict accounting for progress to be achieved under well-defined action programs and their enforcement through regular established procedures, where compliance lags, can restore the damage done by the Defense Department's handling of its program in its dealings with the big Textile firms of Burlington Mills, Cannon Mills and J. P. Stevens. Moreover, it is time that the Department of Defense publicly account for its stewardship of the equal employment opportunity program for defense contractors. Information on its activities and results in the form of detailed statistical data on initial hiring, upgrading and promotion of minority group employees have been unavailable to the public. General reassuring answers are no longer sufficient. We call on the new Secretaries of Defense and of the military departments to publish full data on the operation of the program so that the success or failure thereof can be assessed and steps taken to render it more effective. We call on the cognizant Congressional committees to obtain and publish relevant information and to exercise their influence to render the program truly useful.

We further urge that the Civil Service Commission of the United States take new steps not only to continue to combat or prevent discrimination against employees but also to foster the employment of minority group civil service employees, their promotion to higher positions in the career civil service, than has hitherto been attained, and the correction of earlier acts of discrimination which have prevented in numerous individual cases promotions and advancement of civil service employees belonging to minority groups in the same manner and to the same extent as their white majority fellow employees.

We protest the harassment by men such as Senator Dirksen of public servants who devote their best efforts to the promotion of equal employment opportunity in business, industry and Government for employees belonging to minority groups. Instead of senatorial censure they deserve the support and commendation of the National Administration, of Congress and of all citizens intent upon ending discrimination in employment and all other aspects of public and private life.

RESOLUTION ON MEDICAL BENEFITS

We ask for expansion and higher standards of medical care. In order to avoid a frittering away of limited available funds to pay for Medicare and Medicaid, we ask for strict controls over the performance of, and the fees paid doctors, pharmacists and paramedical personnel to avoid fraud or overreaching or slipshod handling of patients from taking root in the system wherever they may occur. We condemn those professionals and institutions which refuse to participate in public medical care and non-profit insurance programs and urge them to reconsider their stand. The welfare of the American people requires that all those engaged in rendering any kind of health service work together closely so as to enable every American, rich or poor, to obtain the medical care which he needs.

We object to the high prices charged by drug manufacturers for their labeled drugs. As a minimum step, we urge that all public agencies procuring medicines or drugs be instructed to order them only by generic name and not by the brand name of particular manufacturers, and that doctors, hospitals and other institutions providing service under Medicaid and Medicare do likewise.

Finally, we demand the strengthening of FDA so that it can effectively and fully perform its function of keeping ineffective and dangerous drugs from reaching the public.

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL EMPLOYEE SECURITY LEGISLATION

We are convinced that present laws, regulations and procedures fully protect the United States against disloyalty among and against actual or threatened breaches of security by its employees. We, therefore, view with undisguised dismay legislative proposals, now being considered in the Senate of the United States, to expand or tighten existing procedures and to institute a centralized security system for all federal employees with the Chairman of the SABC acting as Grand Inquisitor. In our view, nothing in the present situation calls for new federal employee security legislation or for centralization of administrative action within the federal government. We, therefore, urge the Senate and House and their respective committees to defeat new legislative proposals in this area decisively either in committee or on the floor whenever the occasion arises.

RESOLUTION ON WELFARE POLICY AND SERVICES

That our national welfare system requires a complete overhaul to enable it to perform its function of providing a minimum livelihood and services to the poor has become a truism which only the most hard-hearted can deny. Action, however, has been slow to follow insight.

What is now required, especially in the light of recent court decisions abolishing waiting periods for welfare applicants who have moved from one state to another, and what we, therefore, again demand is:

(1) a uniform, nationwide system of welfare standards and rules which ensure an adequate minimum standard of living to those unable to work for health or family reasons or for lack of jobs paying an adequate wage.

(2) a system by which welfare recipients are encouraged to improve their economic situation by retaining earnings from such work as they can find or perform and by which they are enabled to become independent of welfare support.

(3) the establishment of day care centers to enable welfare mothers to provide for the children necessary care and supervision while they are at work or seek training, if they so desire.

We condemn the new budgetary and social

policies, put into effect in recent months by the Federal, state and local governments across the country, which reduce public benefits and services for the working poor and those unable to provide for themselves and endanger even the continuance of the level of services heretofore provided for them by public agencies.

Specifically we protest:

I

The abolition of the Job Corps centers which deprives thousands of young men and women of the opportunity to complete training for more highly skilled and paid jobs, to gain education and to escape at least temporarily from the evils of a poverty-stricken ghetto life.

II

The transfer, in the cause of alleged economy and efficiency, of Headstart to HEW for administration by generally unsympathetic State educational bureaucracies can only result in depriving numerous young children of the poor of the opportunity to learn early and to initiate the personal development which will help them benefit from education later on.

III

The cutting of medical and welfare benefits in order to balance local budgets or to avoid a heavier tax burden on business activities. All such actions contribute only to cutting off the escape of the poor from their poverty.

IV

We urge the institution of an extensive information program by HEW and local welfare authorities to effectively inform all persons entitled to welfare benefits of their rights.

RESOLUTION ON PROTEST AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Campus unrest has placed in jeopardy the freedom and every existence of institutions of higher education in the United States. Some of this unrest is a concomitant of necessary adjustment in the American educational system as it adapts to the needs of a rapidly changing technological society, to the legitimate demands of all Americans, for new educational programs and to liberalize its structure of governance.

But some campus demonstrations and activities have clearly threatened civil liberties and academic freedom by destroying the ordered environment for teaching and learning that permits the educational process to produce trained men and women who can contribute to the solution of the problems of poverty, race and peace.

As veterans who have directly benefited from the opportunities of education made available to us in recognition of our service and as citizens who have consistently favored expansion of educational opportunity for all, we in AVC know the importance and strategic place in American life of the campus. That is all the more reason for our speaking out against those who seek to "revolutionize" the American University by destroying its essential function as an institution of free inquiry open to all by virtue of ability and not through birth, wealth or status and seek to transform it into an instrument of partisan political and social struggle.

RESOLUTION FOR A SINGLE AMERICAN SOCIETY

As the second anniversary of the appointment of the Kerner Commission which laid out the road to an integrated and more democratic American society is drawing close, we cannot be proud of the progress made. For in many respects little has been accomplished toward the goals set out in its Report which we ringingly endorsed, when it was published. On the contrary, the recent voting trend in overwhelmingly white urban com-

munities shows that far too many white Americans refuse to accord equal consideration to the interests of the Negro minority as to their own or to treat without prejudice Negro candidates competing for public office in areas where Negroes do not predominate. We call upon the President to repudiate these racist attitudes, to rebuke sternly American racists, and to reject the support of racist politicians and voters regardless of party or electoral advantage. We urge the leaders of Congress and of the political parties, and the Governors of the States to do likewise and to show unrelenting vigilance and fortitude in combating racist tendencies.

In the face of all difficulties we must not falter nor despair. As members of AVC, an organization devoted to the welfare of the American people and to the perfection of their right to participate actively in forging their own fate, we reaffirm our faith in the attainment of a truly integrated America in which all people, regardless of their ethnic or religious background, their sex, their age or the color of their skin, can share and enjoy a fruitful life as citizens, as productive members of society, as ordinary men, women and children.

Such a better America needs the help and concern of all its people. It gratefully recognizes the contribution which all Americans have made by their labor and their minds to the welfare of their country. It is proud of the heritage of all its sons and daughters. In this spirit we emphatically recognize and support the healthy desire of the Negro and Spanish-speaking and American Indian minorities to express their pride in their own past, to explore their historical and cultural background, to receive recognition for their cultural achievements and their contributions to America, and to achieve the kind of self-determination which our country vouchsafes to all other groups. We support their insistence that their culture and life become the subject of proper academic study—a demand which is, indeed, on the way to widespread realization. But these goals can be achieved only by participation and not by withdrawal or by a pseudo-revolutionary stance.

Therefore, we reject the siren calls of those who assert:

that men and women of different ethnic backgrounds or skin color never in history could or cannot now live together in equality and join in cooperative behavior;
that the road of liberation for minority groups lies in withdrawal from the larger society and the conquest of a special place controlled by "nationalist" or "separatist" power seekers;

that the university and college student of negro or other minority background must limit himself exclusively to the study of his own group's condition and affairs and undergo nationalist indoctrination;
that the black and other minorities must assert its right through violence and, in particular, should attack religious or ethnic groups within the white majority, which are themselves vulnerable because they have only recently emerged, or are only now emerging, from the blight of discrimination and prejudice.

These are roads with no exits and, notwithstanding the momentary successes of spectacular or violent action, can only lead to defeat, to continued second class status and to the perpetuation of ghetto poverty and ignorance.

We are fully aware of the fact that on the road ahead we shall meet hardened resistance from many elements of the white majority. Many among its prosperous and influential business and professional segments do not desire to contribute through taxes the funds necessary to overcome the lack of jobs, bad housing and schools and all the other effects of past and present discrimination. Others feel that the rise of hitherto economically less-favored minority groups

threatens their social and economic position and the job monopolies which they have secured. Obviously, there will be great resistance to make a place for rising minority group members in power, jobs, and other aspects of life. Only the ceaseless struggle of these minority groups and of all those allied with them in the battle for their rights and for freedom in the United States can win victory.

We pledge ourselves as AVCers, citizens first and veterans second, to continue the fights for social justice, freedom from discrimination, welfare and democratic rights for all Americans to whom these are denied, so that together we may attain the goal of a free, democratic and prosperous America.

RESOLUTION ON MAN'S ENVIRONMENT

Whereas, a state of national and international emergency exists as a result of the accelerating destruction of man's environment, by reason of the massive and continuing pollution of air, water and other natural resources; and

Whereas the magnitude of the factors responsible and the enormous efforts required to reverse these conditions call for action at the highest levels of every major sector of our society,

Now therefore, be it resolved that AVC, in accordance with its traditional role as a civic organization, should call upon the national administration to assemble and sponsor a White House conference of responsible leaders from the federal, state and municipal governments, from science and industry, and from the other organizations in the country, which are or should be working toward the amelioration of these horrifying and destructive conditions, to come together and start doing so.

THE HILLMANS OF PITTSBURGH

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the RECORD the following article entitled "The Hillmans of Pittsburgh," from the September 15, 1969, issue of *Forbes* magazine.

Henry L. Hillman is one of Pittsburgh's most outstanding civic and business leaders. A man of quiet dignity and warm humor, he has earned the respect and admiration of all who know him.

I am sure the Members of Congress and the American people will find much of interest in this fine article of Henry L. Hillman and the Hillman family.

The article follows:

THE HILLMANS OF PITTSBURGH

(NOTE.—A gut businessman, Hart Hillman built a fortune in the coal, iron and steel business. A cool intellectual, his son Henry has expanded that fortune many fold. To the father, business was one big brawl. To the son, it is a kind of chess game.)

Henry Lea Hillman is only the second-richest man in Pittsburgh, and a poor second at that, but since Richard King Mellon ranks first, Hillman is nonetheless one of the richest men in America. He is, in fact, worth something like \$300 million, most of which is in solid value, rather than in inflated stock-market paper.

Yet so little is known about him that when two of his companies were involved in a recent effort to save Piper Aircraft from

the unwelcome attentions of Chris Craft Corp., none of the newspaper reports even mentioned Hillman's name. Chances are that their editors and reporters had never heard of him. "Henry Hillman?" asked a fellow Pittsburgh industrialist recently. "Well, of course, he's in coke and chemicals." The fact is that Hillman is no longer in either.

"We just really have never liked publicity," Hillman declares, "and have tried to avoid it. It serves no purpose, being in the limelight. It's easier to operate without getting your name in the papers or *Forbes* magazine or anyplace else." Actually, the Hillman name does get into the newspapers but not in connection with business. Elsie Hillman—Henry's wife—is chairman of the Allegheny County Republican Party. Henry himself is president of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, the Pittsburgh establishment's vehicle for fighting urban decay. And the Hillmans, of course, were primarily responsible for the recently completed \$12-million Hillman Library at the University of Pittsburgh.

What is little known, however, is that through Hillman Land, the family investment holding company (recently renamed the Hillman Co.), Henry Hillman owns, controls or otherwise influences enough other companies to make most conglomerators green with envy. He is a director of no less than ten major companies, including National Steel, Cummins Engine and Chemical Bank. Through Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical, he either owns or controls half a dozen fair-sized companies, involved in such diverse areas as concrete pipe, sporting goods, power shovels, aircraft parts and air transport. He is the largest stockholder in the Pittsburgh National Corp., the town's second-largest bank (after the Mellon National, naturally); Texas Gas Transmission; Global Marine; Wheeling Pittsburgh Steel; and Copeland Refrigeration. In addition, he has large and strictly private holdings in real estate (including Pittsburgh's 37-story Grant Building), barges, coal brokerage, Texas and Louisiana oil and gas, and assorted small manufacturing operations. Not counting the companies that Hillman merely influences as a director, the Hillman empire had combined revenues last year of roughly \$1 billion, assets of around \$3 billion.

Founded by Henry Hillman's father, John Hartwell Hillman Jr., the Hillman fortune is a rare example of real financial continuity. After more than a half century, the Hillman fortune is still growing—not through the ministrations of sharp young hired hands as in the case of the Rockefeller and the Kennedy fortunes, but under the daily guidance of Henry Hillman himself. Inheritor though he may be, he is also one of the most able businessmen in the U.S. today.

The Hillmans of Pittsburgh are an old family, having arrived in the U.S. as early as 1670. Like the Harrimans and the Mellons who came afterward, they were farmers who only later found their way into business. When that happened, they became blacksmiths first, then forge operators and finally iron workers.

By the time the Civil War broke out, Daniel Hillman, the first Hillman to make any large scale business in business, had established a rolling mill in Kentucky that turned out some of the best boiler plate and bar iron made in the U.S. The war ruined him, as it did most other Southern industrialists, but he managed to reestablish himself afterwards, and some time before his death he acquired the coal and iron ore properties near Birmingham, Ala., that his younger son, Thomas Tennessee Hillman, was to use as the foundation of the mighty Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co., now U.S. Steel's southern unit. In Daniel and T. T. Hillman were the first signs that the Hillmans might possess extraordinary business talents.

Daniel's older son, John Hartwell Hillman,

who was Henry Lea Hillman's grandfather, started out in the family business but in 1886, after his father's death, he moved to Pittsburgh and set himself up in the coal and coke brokerage business. In those days, Pittsburgh was making millionaires by the dozen—Mellons, Fricks, Carnegies—but J. H. Hillman wasn't among them. He loved horses more than he did business, and he lacked both the interest and the drive to propel himself and his family into the ranks of the very rich. But his son, J. H. Hillman Jr., the man who was to become Henry Hillman's father, had drive enough for ten men.

Hart Hillman—as he was called to distinguish him from his father—began selling coke and pig iron when he was 18, and after his father's death, joined with a younger brother, Ernest, and Arthur B. Sheets in forming J. H. Hillman & Sons. It was a company that was to become very nearly as influential in Pittsburgh business affairs as T. Mellon & Sons had been a half century before.

"I just took the crumbs from the Mellon table," Hart Hillman used to say, but even the crumbs were sizable. In less than a half century, he created a second great industrial empire in Pittsburgh. It encompassed coal, iron and steel, chemicals, natural gas, transportation, manufacturing, banks, investments and real estate. The Hillman empire was neither so large nor so diverse as the Mellons', and it created no Gulf Oil or Alcoa. Instead, it emerged from the bits and pieces of other men's failures, opportunities missed and companies ruined and bankrupted. What is most remarkable is that it could have been done at all so late in the history of U.S. capitalism. The Hillmans almost missed the bus but, having caught it, rode it to the very end of the line.

The fact is that J. H. Hillman Jr. was the last of Pittsburgh's great industrial tycoons. In 1898, when he first began selling coal and coke, Pittsburgh businessmen still lived by the law of the jungle, and Hart Hillman learned to operate by those laws. Ironically, this was the very time when the robber barons on whom Hart Hillman modeled himself were beginning to yearn for respectability. In the Twenties, when the Hillman fortune was mounting rapidly, the Carnegie philanthropies were already well established, the Rockefeller had begun their great work in conservation, while the Mellons had already begun planning the National Gallery of Art.

Hart Hillman was not well beloved in his home town. He built his fortunes in a world where the robber baron had gone out of fashion. "At the time he was growing up as a businessman," his son Henry says gingerly, "people operated differently from what they do today. Their methods were a lot rougher, and in later years he tended to be rougher and tougher than a lot of his contemporaries."

Even in memory, Hart Hillman seems to come out of an earlier time, redolent of cigar smoke, frosted glass and oak-wainscotted offices. He always worked in his vest and shirt sleeves, his coat off, but his hat on—and a derby hat at that. He got into the office early, left it late and rarely got out for lunch. "He was one hundred percent business," as one friend puts it, "one hundred percent work. He didn't have any social life to speak of. He didn't play golf or support the symphony. He didn't hang out at the Duquesne Club, and he wouldn't have been caught dead in Rolling Rock, where the Mellon crowd circulated. Hell, they wouldn't have let him in."

He was a big man, six-feet-two or three, with a personal style to match. He was profane and earthy, brusque, inclined to rant and rave, to play the bully. "He was always in a hurry," his son recalls. "I think that created a lot of his impatience and frustration with people. He always wanted to force

things." And he hated publicity. As one old employee recalls, "The first thing Hart Hillman said when I went to work for him was, 'You know, I hire public relations people to keep me out of the press. That's different than others,' and he emphasized that whatever he did or whatever I was going to be doing with him was never to be made public."

"He was just a damned aggressive businessman, and I guess he kicked a few people around," says William Renchard, chairman of New York's Chemical Bank, in which the Hillmans have had an important interest for two generations. "He was a big man, and he was very strong. Very strong-looking. And tall. A very forceful man. In that environment, anybody who put together a bundle as big as J. H. Hillman did was bound to rub some people the wrong way."

"He was a very tough operator," says George M. Humphrey, Eisenhower's Secretary of the Treasury and former chairman of Hanna Mining, who was associated with Hillman in several deals. "He was smarter than most people and worked harder and out-traded a lot of them, and that's what they objected to. But we never had any trouble of any kind."

The formation of J. H. Hillman & Sons in 1913 marked the beginning of the Hillman fortune. Eager to protect himself both on the demand and supply side, Hillman branched out beyond the brokerage business into the ownership of coal mines, barges, coke ovens and blast furnaces. "This was the era when people could really make money in the coal fields," says Michael Budzanoski, president of the United Mine Workers' Pittsburgh Office. "It was a vicious business, and you had to be on your toes or you ended up in the gutter."

Hillman stayed on his toes. Within 20 years he had established himself as one of the Big Four in the coal industry—along with Pittsburgh Coal, Union Collieries and Westmoreland Coal. By 1935 the various Hillman companies operated 15 mines, produced 1.1 million tons of coal a year, and boasted reserves of more than 225 million tons.

Hillman's great ambition in those days was to win first place in the coal industry, and during the Depression he tried repeatedly to take over the industry's largest producer, Mellon-controlled Pittsburgh Coal. Pittsburgh Coal was losing money, and the Mellons no longer had much interest in it. "Hart worked very hard to make a deal with the Mellons for Pittsburgh Coal," George Humphrey recalls. "Then he'd really be in the coal business." But the Mellons refused to sell. That was their privilege and his misfortune. It was not George Humphrey's misfortune, however. A few years later, Humphrey's M. A. Hanna Co. acquired Pittsburgh Coal which, as Consolidation Coal, became the largest and most profitable coal producer in the world.

As his Pittsburgh Coal gambit suggests, for Hillman depressions were always as much opportunities as they were hazards. It was no accident that most of the important Hillman coal ventures—Hecla Coal & Coke, a 1917 consolidation of four companies; Hillman Coal & Coke, a 1924 consolidation of six others; Emerald Coal and Coke, 1931; and W. J. Rainey, 1939—came under Hillman's domination in the wake of major recessions. Hillman always kept cash on hand for picking up bargains. Even in the late Forties, when the coal industry was in chaos and Hillman himself had begun to withdraw from coal production, he was trying to pick up for back taxes a 2,600-acre tract in Greene County, Pa. that had once been part of the Thompson coal empire. "He knew the value of cash," says British-born D.G. (for Douglas George) Sisterson, 75, his accountant for four decades and now chairman of the Hillman Co., "and he didn't go any deeper into debt than he had to. In other words, he didn't believe too much in leverage."

In a depression, of course, the real trick is to distinguish value from price, to tell a potential bargain from a potential bankrupt. But Hillman had the knack. In 1931, for instance, when he decided to buy up the Emerald mine and its adjoining coal lands, some of his partners thought he was crazy. The property, after all, was falling. But Hillman saw the Emerald's inherent worth—its enormous reserves of high quality metallurgical coal, its strategic location on the Monongahela River—and bought it anyway. "He could see the long-range success of that property," Sisterson says, "as against others." Now under lease to Gateway Coal, the Emerald mine returns the Hillman Co. around \$1.2 million in annual royalties.

Hillman's rougher side also showed up during the Depression in his talent for buying out minority stockholders at extremely favorable prices. "The company required money to modernize it," says one such minority stockholder. "Mr. Hillman advanced the money, but instead of its going into modernization it was dissipated in operating losses. As minority stockholders we were finally compelled to object. It was a question of ineptitude, I suppose. But we weren't ready to put up the additional capital ourselves. So Mr. Hillman bought us out, paid us maybe a few cents on the dollar."

At the same time that Hillman was expanding in coal, he had also begun acquiring dominant interests in a half dozen or so of Pittsburgh's smaller banks, and for the next 30 years he maneuvered and plotted to put them all together. His motives were elementary. Not only could you realize significant economies in bank mergers, you could also do more with a big bank than you could with a small one.

It took nearly a half century and three major mergers (the last in 1959, only two weeks before his death) but he finally succeeded in merging them all into the Pittsburgh National Bank. "He wanted to see it done," PNB's President Merle Gilliland says, "not because of any personal satisfaction—he was ill by that time, and it didn't mean that much to him anymore—but he saw the economic advantage. He was very emotional about it. And when the merger was finally approved he was a very happy man."

Without the banks and the financial support they could give him in expanding his operations, it is doubtful that Hillman would have been able to come so far so fast. In the late Twenties he established an important alliance with New York's Chemical Bank. Chemical had been trying to expand nationally and when the Mellon Bank refused to give it the time of day, Chemical turned to Hillman and his extensive connections for business. It got plenty. For years Hillman was Chemical's largest single customer.

"He was the one important businessman in Pittsburgh," says Chemical's William Renchard, "who didn't kowtow to the Mellons. In those days, in the Thirties, the Mellons didn't like him much. They hated his guts. Somehow or other he must have kicked them in the shins or gotten something they thought belonged to them. If you're in Pittsburgh and you buck the Mellons, you've got to be pretty tough."

Hillman was tough, no question of that. The man who refused to kowtow to the Mellons did not tremble even before the house of Morgan. In the early days of the Depression, when the Missouri-Kansas Pipeline Co. needed money to complete the construction of its Panhandle Eastern and Kentucky Natural Gas subsidiaries, they turned to Hillman. Panhandle had ambitions of building into Columbia Gas' territory, and Columbia, which had a half interest in Panhandle, feared that when its system was complete, Panhandle would have the financial strength to do so. "There was terrific pressure on Hillman to keep him from doing it," one Panhandle official recalls, "but he

thumbed his nose at the House of Morgan, which of course controlled Columbia Gas, and loaned them the money. It took a lot of courage."

And so, in 1931, Hillman loaned \$6 million to Missouri-Kansas and its Panhandle Corp. subsidiary, which with Columbia Gas owned Panhandle Eastern Pipeline. Within a year, both MoKan and Kentucky Natural were bankrupt, and in the end Hillman wound up with all of Kentucky Natural's stock and most of the stock of Panhandle Corp. It was these Panhandle holdings that a few years later brought down upon Hillman a landmark antitrust suit in which he was charged with having conspired with Columbia to keep Panhandle from moving into Columbia's markets.

"So Hillman spent 13 years working out his investment," Sisterson says. "He had the foresight to see what could be done, and the other creditors didn't, so he bought them out. But it was a rough time, between the money going out in legal expenses and operations and things like that." With Kentucky Natural in his control, Hillman next acquired Memphis Natural, and finally realized the only way to make the two pay off was to build the Texas Gas pipeline from Texas all the way to Ohio and tie them together.

The risks were enormous, Sisterson recalls. "They had to finance the total pipeline, and they had to get it certified by the Federal Power Commission. I remember—the day I think was March 31, 1948—J. H. Hillman Jr. was literally pacing the floor, because they were committed for \$60 million in debt, they had been drawing against it—making purchase contracts for gas, sales contracts for deliveries at the other end, buying pipe and so on, and this was the last day for the FPC to certify the line. The certification came through. But if it hadn't, I don't know what might have happened."

Coal, however, remained Hillman's first love. He was now both a broker and a producer. But whenever business slackened off, it was independents like Hillman who felt the crunch first. "If a coal mine is operating," Sisterson says, "it does right well. But if it isn't, its costs still remain pretty high." And so, in the Twenties Hillman began acquiring interests in a number of potential customers—in coke and iron companies, in steel producers and fabricators—in any sort of company that might conceivably use Hillman coal—A. M. Byers, the wrought iron producer; National Supply, the oil well pipe makers; Sharon and Pittsburgh Steel. Thereafter, when Hillman customers cut back their coal requirements, some other supplier would be the first to go. But with Hillman, one thing always led to another, and in 1927 he dumped his industrial holdings into an investment company, Pennsylvania Industries, sold stock to the public, and used the proceeds to expand even further.

As Hillman's interests multiplied, outside stockholders complained periodically that he ran the various companies he controlled for his own benefit—and apparently not without some justification. On one occasion, they charged that Hillman-controlled Pittsburgh Steel had bought some securities from another Hillman company at much too high a price. On another, they charged that Pittsburgh Steel had made much too favorable a contract with Hillman Coal & Coke to manage certain of its coal and coking operations. Certainly, to an extent at least, the Hillman companies were run for each other's benefit if not directly for J. H. Hillman's.

What made Hillman especially vulnerable is that he rarely acquired anything like majority control in the companies in which he had an interest. He rarely needed to. In Hart Hillman's hands, a 15% stock interest was often as good as 50% in anyone else's. Better. By sheer force of personality he

could often domineer his way into control of a company. "J. H. was a pretty dominant personality," Sisterson says with a grin.

Nowhere is Hillman's ability to get the greatest possible mileage out of his limited resources more evident than in his foray into the steel industry during the Thirties. Hillman's Pennsylvania Industries had had an almost 10% interest in Sharon Steel ever since the Twenties. Then, in 1930 it acquired a 120,000-share block of National Supply, the oil well pipe maker that is now part of Armco Steel. Hillman went on the National Supply board and for a time even acted as chairman.

During the worst of the Depression, Hillman was content to sit tight. Then, in 1936, Sharon Steel picked up a 15% interest in Pittsburgh Steel, enough to put Hillman on the Pittsburgh board and Sharon's president in as head of Pittsburgh. A merger of the two companies seemed inevitable—indeed, for seven, the two companies shared common officers—but Hillman was thinking bigger than that. In 1938, he sold Pittsburgh his National Supply holdings for a 28% interest in Pittsburgh Steel. Thus, in one stroke, he tightened his hold on Pittsburgh, without perceptibly loosening his grip on National Supply.

But for all his wheeling and dealing, Hillman was never able to work out his mergers. Pittsburgh and Sharon came to a parting of the ways in 1943, and a year later National Supply's management sought to throw off Hillman's domination, charging that, in controlling National Supply, Hillman was in violation of the antitrust laws. In response, Hillman launched a proxy fight and lost, just as two years later he was to lose a similar fight for control of Alan Wood Steel.

What went wrong? For one thing, Hillman never really acquired enough stock to control either Sharon or National Supply. More basic than that were the brass-knuckled tactics that alienated the managements of both companies. "They didn't like Hart Hillman," a close associate of the time says. "It's as simple as that." Hillman's objectives were sound, however. He saw quite correctly that Pittsburgh Steel needed a merger if it was ever going to be any more than a marginal producer. But he clearly lacked the talent to bring it about.

Hillman's whole business experience had trained him perfectly to capitalize on the opportunities presented by the Thirties, however. It was no accident that none of the Hillman banks went bankrupt, though there were admittedly some close calls, and it was no accident either that he eventually succeeded in working his way out of virtually every bankrupt industrial company he got caught in.

But it required great patience and often considerable operating talent. Take Pittsburgh Coke, now one of the main pillars of the Hillman fortune. The company went into business in 1928 as Davison Coke & Iron, and in order to get part of its coal contracts, Hillman in 1929 agreed to help finance its expansion. Davison went into default, however, in 1932, and though Hillman and another creditor, W. J. Rainey, Inc., worked out a temporary reorganization, it wasn't enough, and in 1935 the company went bankrupt.

Hillman spent the next several years attempting to rescue his investment, liquidating what was not worth preserving and merging into it other companies that would strengthen it. By the end of World War II, Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical, as Davison had been renamed, was a small but remarkably well integrated little company. It turned its own coal into coke and then converted the by-product tars and gases into chemicals. It used the coke to make pig iron and the slag that was left in the manufacture of cement. A small company admittedly, but for a time at least something of a jewel.

In Pittsburgh Coke, Hillman found himself in partnership with George Humphrey and

the M. A. Hanna Co., which, like Hillman, had been a Davison creditor. "J. H. was a great admirer of George Humphrey," Sisterson says. "He liked the look of the Hanna Co.—the way they had it set up, and the way the thing worked for the Hanna family." A coal and iron ore mining company, Hanna had made major investments in some of its principal customers, thereby cementing the supplier-customer relationship. The resulting combination of dividend and operating income produced considerable stability of earnings. "To some extent, Mr. Hillman patterned his own operations after the Hanna Co.," Sisterson says, "and he did quite well." Which explains the hybrid structure of both Pittsburgh Coke and the Hillman Co.: half operating company, half investment company.

By this time, Hillman, like T. Mellon before him, had earned a fairly widespread reputation as a forecloser. Davison wasn't the only example. There were, among others, the Bellefield Co., proprietor of Pittsburgh's once fashionable Schenley Hotel; the Pittsburgh Terminal Railways; even W. J. Rainey, Hillman's old partner in Davison Coke & Iron.

In the early Thirties, Hillman had sold Rainey some coal properties, and Rainey had paid for them in mortgage bonds. During the 1938 recession, however, Rainey defaulted on the bonds. But Hillman didn't foreclose. Instead, he lent Rainey the money to pay the interest and would have lent more. But unexpectedly Rainey went into voluntary bankruptcy—"They must have thought they could get a better deal," Sisterson comments—but that didn't help Hillman's reputation any. "Some of the things that were said about him were just not so," Sisterson says. "I knew the facts, but Mr. Hillman shunned publicity, so nobody ever knew."

"I know they called him a pirate," says a former colleague, "but I never saw any of it. He was very generous. Brusque, sure, but really considerate. He knew I was pressed for money, and he told his people, when my bills came in, to pay them promptly. They were paid almost before they got there."

"He was a hard taskmaster, the old boy," Sisterson says, "but I survived, and I enjoyed it. I liked him. I admired him. But it was never easy."

"When you know someone as one does a father," says Henry Hillman, "you see him in a completely different light. Deep down, he was a soft, warm person. He really loved people. He was, I felt, wonderful to his family. I had just the finest relationship in the world. It was really unusual."

"His insides were just made of melted butter," says Elsie Hillman, his daughter-in-law, Henry's wife. "He had more people that he sort of took care of over the years, people he'd been kind and good to for no apparent reason other than that they'd got a little piece of his heart somewhere along the line."

J. H. Hillman's wife died in 1940, and in 1948, at the age of 68, he was married a second time—this time to a 43-year-old divorcee, Dora Keen Butcher Russell, a sister of Philadelphia stockbroker Howard Butcher III and mother of two young children whom Hart Hillman adopted as his own. "Some time after he married," says Chemical's William Renchard, "I went into his office, and he had his hat off and his coat on. And I said, 'I see there's been a change—from a hat and no coat to a coat and no hat.' She was a very fine lady, and she changed his office, but she couldn't change him in other ways."

During the last decade of his life, J. H. Hillman began to consolidate the gains he had made during the Thirties and during the war. He sold off his interests in Alan Wood Steel, A. M. Byers, Sharon Steel and National Supply. He liquidated Pennsylvania Industries, and he even began to withdraw from the coal business. He found he could do better leasing or buying and selling coal lands than he could operating them. What remained were the four companies that stand as monuments to his business talents: Pitts-

burgh National, Texas Gas, Pittsburgh Coke and Pittsburgh Steel (now Wheeling Pittsburgh). Singly or together, they are no inconsiderable achievement.

"He certainly wasn't interested merely in amassing money," Henry Hillman says. "He felt—and I certainly feel—that business can be a lot of fun. You're dealing with interesting people, interesting problems. It's a very active and challenging game, with the signals always changing, the circumstances changing. I think he just loved it."

"Hart Hillman liked business," one longtime associate observes. "He liked it the way A. W. Mellon liked business. It was part of the spirit of the age . . . the Harrimans . . . the Vanderbilts. . . . It was an amazing financial triumph, wasn't it?"

At 50, Henry Lea Hillman projects almost perfectly the image of inherited wealth. A tall man like his father, blond, trim, athletic, he must once have looked like one of those golden people in Scott Fitzgerald's novels. But he is somewhat older than that now. His hair has begun to thin, the lines in his face have deepened. Yet there remains some of that special grace about him. His manner is easy and self-assured, courteous, the speech measured, almost painfully judicious, broken with quick nervous smiles that wink on and off like a warning signal.

Despite his considerable reserve, he has in recent years assumed fully the public responsibilities of great wealth. He was a member of Pittsburgh's Urban Redevelopment Authority for over a dozen years, a director of Children's Hospital, a trustee of the University of Pittsburgh.

But it is as president of Pittsburgh's Allegheny Conference on Community Development that he has come into his own. At his instigation, the Allegheny Conference has shifted its emphasis entirely—from rebuilding the physical city of Pittsburgh to rehabilitating the human one—to finding jobs for its ghetto residents, retraining them, finding the backing to enable them to start their own businesses. A hardly revolutionary program, it is true, but a significant one in a city where the business response to the urban crisis has been to install bullet-proof glass in the Duquesne Club's windows.

"In respect to the public good," says Pennsylvania Congressman William Moorhead, "Henry's moving in almost exactly the same direction that Richard K. Mellon was twenty years ago."

His civic and philanthropic activities notwithstanding, Henry Hillman is not simply an inheritor of great wealth. He is an accumulator in his own right, and he gives every sign of intending to remain so. Over the past decade, he has taken the fortune he inherited from his father and transformed it, restructured it, and multiplied it many fold. By just how much, Henry Hillman refuses to say. But if Pittsburgh Coke & Chemical, the one public company whose fortunes he has been directly responsible for is any index, the Hillman fortune has probably tripled. Since 1958 Pittsburgh Coke's net asset value has risen from \$36 to \$118 a share, its common stock from 21 to over 100.

"There are as many opportunities now," Henry Hillman says, "as there were when my father was alive and as I think there will be in the future. Our method of operating is very different from what it was then, but basically I think the objective is the same—to put two or more things together to make a better package."

Considering the varied temptations that beset rich men's sons, it is fairly rare for so dominant a personality as J. H. Hillman to produce a son both able and willing to succeed him. His older son, John Hartwell Hillman III, successfully resisted any attempt to propel him into the family business, preferring instead to run a series of small businesses on his own. But his son Henry

became not only a businessman but an immensely capable one.

Henry Hillman went to Shady Side Academy in Pittsburgh, then to the Taft School and to Princeton, where he majored in geology. After three years as a Navy flyer during World War II, he went to work for Pittsburgh Coke, getting to know that company thoroughly, and then, after attending Harvard's advanced management course, began acquainting himself with the rest of the Hillman empire by serving as a director of the various Hillman companies. And finally, at 37, in 1955, he became president of Pittsburgh Coke.

"I think every father likes to see a business continue if he's gotten it going," Henry Hillman says, "but I believe I always intended to go into business. I was pretty well raised on it. My father talked with me a great deal, exposed me to business through plant visits, discussions and conversations. I started to work summers when I was about 16. But I never really—all the time he was alive—worked directly for him, which I think maybe was a good thing—not to have one's father looking over one's shoulder. Later when he became ill, I was able to help out on projects he's been working on."

But once he took over at both Pittsburgh Coke and the Hillman Co., Henry Hillman made it abundantly clear that he was his own man, with his own distinctive style and his own distinctive talents. He does share his father's reserve—that reticence, that distaste for publicity—and his considerable business talent. But in his personal style he is almost everything his father was not.

"Some people have to rant and rave to get things done," says Merle Gilliland, president of the Pittsburgh National Bank. "Henry doesn't. I've never heard him raise his voice. But he tells you how he feels. You know he's either with you or not." Yet, for all their differences, father and son often seem basically much alike.

Over the past decade, Henry Hillman has liquidated a large proportion of his father's empire with a dispassionateness that would have done Hart Hillman proud. J. H. Hillman & Sons, the company his father founded, is no more, having been merged into the Hillman Co. two years ago, and even the traditional Hillman companies are gradually being set adrift. The Hillman interest in Pittsburgh National and Texas Gas is well below 10%. And currently, Hillman, in effect, is getting out of Wheeling Pittsburgh, having cut his interest from 6% to under 1%. As it is, he does not even have a stock interest in Texas Gas anymore, save through the Hillman Foundation. Only Pittsburgh Coke—the company Henry Hillman has rebuilt in his own image over the past decade—is likely to remain a major Hillman property, and, with the Hillman Co. in possession of 90% of its stock, Pittsburgh Coke in effect has just gone private. "We have no long-term commitment to any investment," Henry Hillman explains. "We feel we have to be completely flexible."

Different times and different circumstances obviously dictate different courses. J. H. Hillman was concerned with building an empire, much of it during the Depression; Henry Hillman has been concerned with cultivating a fortune, primarily during the Boom. The result is that J. H. Hillman was always looking for something that was worth more than it cost, just as Henry Hillman keeps looking for things that cost less than they are worth. Fundamentally, one was a buyer, the other a seller; one concerned with value, the other with price. "When times change," Henry Hillman says, "you have to change."

Certainly in 1960, the year after J. H. Hillman died, Pittsburgh Coke did not look like a particularly dynamic company. Its coke and pig iron business was at a cyclical low, its

by-product chemical business was suffering from overcapacity. Only its cement and activated carbon businesses were flourishing, and both of these were small. In the circumstances, any prudent businessman might have decided to diversify into something else. And Pittsburgh Coke did, moving into such new businesses as concrete pipe (U.S. Concrete Pipe), mining and excavating equipment (Marion Power Shovel), airlines (American Flyers), and aircraft parts (Standard Aircraft Equipment). But in order to do so, it quietly disposed of virtually all its original assets. The iron and coke division went to Shenango, Inc., the chemical divisions to U.S. Steel, the activated carbon division to Calgon and the cement business to Marquette Cement. Today Pittsburgh Coke does not have a single one of the major assets it had when Henry Hillman took over.

"In every case," Hillman says, "we saw another investment opportunity more attractive than the one we had before. Every move was evolutionary. It was a question of taking one step at a time, looking at each individual area and making a decision on it. It was not that what we had was bad or undesirable. It was just that we looked and found more attractive opportunities as we went along."

Obviously, this is no operating man's point of view. It is the viewpoint of the asset manager, and in the circumstances it is hardly surprising that within a relatively few years it transformed Pittsburgh Coke from an operating company into an investment holding company.

"In general, we look for a substantial appreciation in asset value," Henry Hillman says. "Basically you look at the arithmetic—the cost of what you're buying relative to a number of factors—its competitive position in an industry, for instance, and the outlook for the industry itself—and you make a decision. Like everyone else, we like to get into situations where management is good. We're not interested in moving in and taking over. The more decentralized you are, the freer you are to pay attention to the other opportunities that come along. We try to get into a variety of investments. Obviously some are quite secure, and we look for a much lower rate of appreciation than we do from something that's riskier. We try to set a balance between the two, which I think we've achieved."

There were signs of the change to come even before J. H. Hillman died. In 1955 Pittsburgh Coke exchanged its agricultural chemicals business for a half interest in Chemagro, a partnership with Farbenfabriken Bayer. Two years later, it sold its Great Lakes Steamship subsidiary to Wilson Marine Transit for cash and common stock. Significantly, both of these transactions involved at least the partial conversion of operating properties into investments, and for both Henry Hillman was primarily responsible.

But it was not until after his father's death that he was able to do what he wanted to with the company. "He'd been sick for a few years," Henry Hillman says. "Even though I was doing some of the things that the head of the company would do, I was not the head of the company as such, and it just was not feasible to move at the same speed."

Once in control, he moved very fast indeed. In 1963 Pittsburgh Coke notified U.S. Steel that its cash requirements were such that it was considering selling its Pittsburgh Chemical subsidiary, which happened to be one of U.S. Steel's major naphthalene customers. To prevent that and to preserve its "opportunity to compete for this business," U.S. Steel guaranteed \$5 million in Pittsburgh Chemical bank loans, which were used to retire part of Pittsburgh Coke's advances, and bought a 25% interest in Pittsburgh Chemical for \$2.6 million.

At the time, U.S. Steel was considering

entering the chemical business, and finally in 1964 it took the plunge, acquiring Pittsburgh Chemical's industrial chemicals and protective coatings divisions as the nucleus of what has since become USS Chemicals. Pittsburgh Coke had a book loss of \$6.6 million on the deal, but it had eliminated \$800,000 in annual operating losses, and it still retained PC's activated carbon business.

Pittsburgh Coke had also obtained the right to buy back at cost U.S. Steel's 25% stock interest in Pittsburgh Chemical (now renamed Pittsburgh Activated Carbon. That proved remarkably farsighted, because a few months later the Calgon Corp. approached Pittsburgh Coke about the possibility of acquiring Activated Carbon. The two were a natural fit. Calgon was a water-purification company. Activated Carbon produced filtering materials. And so, with U.S. Steel's 25% interest in hand, Pittsburgh Coke worked out a deal in December 1965 to sell Activated Carbon for \$43 million in Calgon stock.

Meanwhile, Merck & Co., the big New Jersey pharmaceutical house, had decided to diversify, and it had settled on water purification as one logical extension of its existing skills and Calgon as a likely prospect for acquisition in that area. Calgon's executives were reportedly less than overjoyed at having the company sold out from under them, but, with a third of the stock, Pittsburgh Coke was in the driver's seat. And so, in January 1968 Pittsburgh Coke exchanged its 1.2 million shares of Calgon for 1 million shares of Merck, worth at that time something like \$80 million.

Pittsburgh Coke now had 55% of its assets concentrated in a single security, Merck, and Henry Hillman did not intend to spend his life collecting Merck dividends. Last summer Pittsburgh Coke offered to exchange 557,913 of its 1 million Merck shares for the publicly owned common and preferred of Pittsburgh Coke itself. Worth \$10 million when U.S. Steel had an interest in it, Pittsburgh Coke's Activated Carbon business had been transformed into stock with a market value of \$93 million, an appreciation of 830% in just under three years.

Though Pittsburgh Coke common was then selling for less than 80, last February Hillman offered to exchange it for 1.1 shares of Merck worth roughly \$95 a share vs. a net asset value at year's end of \$105.20. "The exchange," Hillman says, "seems favorable to both those going out and those staying in. If they stay in, it certainly doesn't hurt them. If they want to get out, they get a good value."

Undoubtedly they do. Long range, however, the Hillman Co.—which held onto its Pittsburgh Coke shares—probably got the best deal of all. With the exchange complete, Pittsburgh Coke's net asset value has soared from \$105 to \$118 a share. In effect, the exchange was a way of buying underpriced assets with higher-priced paper.

"When he's got something that's fully priced," Howard Butcher III says of the Merck deal, "why, Henry's not adverse to selling it. That's the difference between a businessman and a really smart businessman. A lot of businessmen just buy things and forget to sell things. But Henry sells them just when they get to be ripe. He's very sensible and turns them into cash and puts them to work in the best place possible. The Merck is fully priced, you see, so he's selling it in effect—giving it to others."

In seeking new deals, Henry Hillman quite frankly shies away from large companies. "Smaller companies very frequently have greater appreciation possibilities," he explains. "Larger companies have reached a state of maturity, and it's more difficult to get a doubling of value within a reasonable period of time. But in small companies you can come in and talk to people, get to know and understand them, and generate the kind of spirit that can get them moving." What

is most notable, of course, is Hillman's talent for transforming a small situation into a large one, an Activated Carbon into a Merck, or—almost—a SouthPly, and a U.S. Concrete into a Piper Aircraft.

In an effort to escape Chris Craft, Piper's management last spring was prepared to pay and pay generously, and Henry Hillman was ready to oblige. He was prepared to sell SouthPly, which had a negligible net worth, for \$10 million in Piper stock, and U.S. Concrete Pipe of Florida, carried on the books at \$8.4 million, for an additional \$23 million in stock. Hillman would have wound up with close to a fourth of Piper's stock vs. 35% for the Piper family itself. But that deal never came off.

Hillman's basic method is, as he says, to put two or more things together to make a better package. Thus, Goetz Optical, which the Hillman Co. acquired in 1964, merged last year with an instrumentation company, Kollmorgen Corp., for 95,000 shares (10%). Nichols Aluminum (aluminum wire and sheet), acquired in 1965, was merged only last June with Homeshield Industries (aluminum building materials). And having acquired Melchior, Armstrong, Dessau in 1965, Hillman strengthened its existing businesses by acquiring Foregger (hospital supplies) and Bahnson (air-conditioning systems).

Like his father before him, however, Henry Hillman has generally shied away from the kind of venture capital investment that can afford really huge returns, the backing of brand-new companies. With one notable exception, of course: Global Marine, Los Angeles' contract offshore drilling outfit, and Global Marine turned out to be one of Henry Hillman's biggest and most successful coups.

Significantly, however, Henry Hillman didn't find Global Marine. Global Marine found him, sought him out to provide the capital the company needed to expand when General Tire unexpectedly backed out. "We went to him," GM's president, A. J. Field, recalls, "and he made a rather fast decision, for which we admired him. He's a good financial man, but basically, he's interested subjectively in things, looking for people, basically, to bet on. Henry's not a man to throw his weight around. He's a man who thinks in terms of broad concepts, things, rather than the balance sheet."

Henry Hillman also has his father's love of the deal—the ingenious maneuver, the dazzling coup—which is why, for all his aversion to publicity, you find him periodically on the fringes of what could become highly public situations. He risked public exposure last spring in getting involved in Piper Aircraft (and, as this story makes clear, finally got caught), just as he had done earlier in backing management at Copeland Refrigeration when industrialist Bernard McDonough made threatening takeover gestures a couple of years ago.

With McDonough on the scene, Copeland's chairman Frank Gleason worked out a deal to acquire a refrigerator distributorship from Hillman's Melchior, Armstrong Dessau subsidiary. "A number of companies in the business have bought up distributorships," Henry Hillman explains innocently, "feeling that if they understand some of the problems of being a distributor they'll be able to serve their other customers better."

Maybe so. But the purchase also put a large block of Copeland stock in friendly hands. Even more curious, Copeland bought the Hillman distributorship on approval—for 105,000 shares (7% of the total outstanding)—with the understanding that within a year it could, if it chose, sell the distributorship back to Hillman at cost—in cash, however, not stock. Outmaneuvered McDonough backed off and eventually sold out—to Henry L. Hillman. In the end, Copeland decided it didn't want the distributorship after all and sold it back to Hillman—for cash. By that

time, however, Hillman's 105,000 Copeland shares were worth \$4 million, vs. \$2.2 million when he bought them, and with McDonough's shares in hand, Hillman had clearly established himself as Copeland's largest shareholder.

Unlike McDonough, Hillman—as he repeats constantly—has no interest in taking control of the companies he takes positions in. He usually becomes a director and he makes his views known, but that's about all. Pittsburgh Coke, he admits, has gotten involved recently in the reorganization of its American Flyers airline, a Pennsylvania-based supplementary airline. But that's because American Flyers' staff is small and hasn't the resources to do the job alone. "Being spread as widely as we are," Henry Hillman says, "we don't feel we can, or should, or care to try to operate things."

This is sound management practice these days, of course, but it is also the normal course of second-generation wealth. As the UMW's Pittsburgh chief, Mike Budzanoski, puts it, "When the founder of a fortune passes away, the family is often not interested in continuing in the same mode. When you're an industrialist, you're actually producing something, and there's a certain amount of hard work and heartbreak in that. But if you're a financier or an investment manager, you take your chances and manipulate your money in such a way as to bring back the quickest return. Like the Rockefeller and Kennedy families—most of them prefer to enhance their fortunes without actually getting their hands dirty."

Henry Hillman occupies a kind of middle position. He doesn't like getting his hands dirty as his father enjoyed doing. But he hasn't turned his back on active business as most scions of great wealth have either. Not by a long shot.

THE WASTED DEFENSE DOLLAR

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have brought to the attention of my colleagues a large number of articles written by Everett Allen, the assistant to the editor of the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times. During the past year he has written two 12-part series on the ABM, both of which have appeared in this journal. These efforts have established him as one of the leading journalistic authorities on anti-ballistic-missile defense.

Most recently, Mr. Allen has authored a five-part series on "The Wasted Defense Dollar" which was published in the Standard-Times during the month of August. Concentrating on two case studies, Mr. Allen examines the inadequate contracting and supervisory practices which may have contributed to the sinking of the submarine *Guitarro* at its dock in San Francisco and to the high level of defects in oceanographic equipment purchased by the Navy. In his concluding essay, the author finds a solution to sloppy procurement practices in H.R. 474, a bill now being considered by the Government Operations Committee. This measure would establish a Hoover Commission to study Government contracting procedures. With the adoption of this legislation, Mr. Allen believes, ef-

fective congressional oversight of defense spending can be reasserted.

Mr. Speaker, in order to bring this thoughtful series of articles on wasteful defense spending to the attention of my colleagues, I include them in the RECORD at this point:

THE WASTED DEFENSE DOLLAR—I: TIGHTER CONTROLS OVER ARMS INDUSTRY DEMANDED
(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—American industry does not and cannot properly—have the responsibility for insuring a successful U.S. defense product.

Industry is basically motivated by profit and it must be, if it is to continue to exist. Therefore, industry cannot be counted upon to provide successful defense products without close government technical control. Ample experience indicates that industry does not want tight specifications and tight inspection.

This opinion, one of the most candid offered to date in the continuing colloquy on U.S. military-industry relationships, is that of Rear Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, director of the Navy's Division of Naval Reactors, and the "father" of the atomic submarine.

\$44 BILLION ANNUALLY

The scope of what he is talking about may be judged by the fact that of a total of \$50 billion annually spent in government procurement, \$44 billion is spent by the Defense Department. There are 40,000 civilian defense procurement officials, plus an additional 1,500 military personnel assigned to procurement matters.

This series of articles is principally concerned with detailed consideration of two Navy-civilian procurement relationships, one involving Navy Yard services, the other, the purchase of oceanographic equipment.

These examples were selected to show some of the weaknesses of the over-all military-industrial relationship because their simplicity of circumstance makes them easier to comprehend than many of the long-running contractual arrangements.

Admiral Rickover expressed his view, and related comment, during a closed-door session in the Capitol of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

He greatly impressed his listeners. In a lengthy interview with The Standard-Times—concerned primarily with this aspect of the admiral's testimony—Rep. Chet Hollifield, D-Calif., chairman of the prestigious joint committee and a member of the House of Representatives for a quarter-century, commented, "In my opinion, Admiral Rickover is one of the most efficient buyers in the whole structure of government procurement."

DILIGENT IN DEMANDING

"He is diligent in demanding from industry the fulfillment of every contract on the basis of absolute compliance with quality specifications."

The admiral is disturbed by the Navy's present inability to achieve top quality in both goods and services provided by the civilian sector and, primarily, he blames both the Navy and the Defense Department.

He deplores the fact that no government emphasis is being placed "on assembling and training technical groups necessary to provide direct control of this complex work—technical groups that have the resources and ability to be, in fact, directly responsible for carrying out this difficult work—and purchasing groups that have the ability and training to obtain from industry contractual terms that are in the government's best interests."

In taking this position, Mr. Rickover, the Navy erudite, stormy petrel, once more needed some of his high-ranking colleagues and the Pentagon as well.

NO ONE RUNS STORE

However, among his allies is Robert A. Froesch, assistant secretary of the Navy for research and development, who commented, "As we are now behaving, we are using up our best people in filling out documentation for their superiors to read, and most of the time, no one is running the store."

To considerable degree, the principles and problems that bother the admiral may be broadly applied to the total government-industry relationship in defense procurement. This multi-billion dollar marriage is in need of major reform, principally because its guidelines and ground rules have lagged behind the revolutionary growth in size and sophistication of defense demands.

Some of the shortcomings, manifested in the massive loss of dollars, if not, in fact in lives, of which the admiral complains, are these:

1. The lack of a strong submarine design capability in the United States is one of the most important problems facing the Navy today, yet "it doesn't even appear to be recognized. The investigation following the loss of the Thresher should have made this abundantly clear to everyone, but it didn't. All that was done was to spend several hundred million dollars in the SUBSAFE program to patch up the mistakes of the submarine designers in going to deeper, and faster submarines than they were used to."

NOTHING DONE

"Nothing was done to establish a technically stronger submarine design organization to meet increasing new requirements. If anything, submarine design is less controlled technically today than it was when the Thresher was designed."

2. The whole tendency of the Navy is to do away with technical expertise and to have the "remaining people become 'managers.' This came forcefully to my attention several years ago when I started looking in detail into the non-propulsion area of the NR-1 design. I found that the Naval Ship Systems Command did not have even one person assigned full time to the non-propulsion aspects of the NR-1, regardless of the fact that the NR-1 will be the deepest diving nuclear submarine ever built. The people who know about submarine design had been assigned to administrative organizations."

"I wrote a rather forceful letter, and I got two people assigned responsibility for the non-propulsion aspects of the submarine. I also discovered that had I allowed the NR-1 non-propulsion plant design to continue the way it was proceeding, failures would quite probably have occurred. This further illustrated that considerable improvement was needed both in industry and in the Navy in submarine design capability."

The admiral added, "However, the way things are going, the technical proficiency of the Navy is being reduced every day. The Russians have taken advantage of this trend and now are clearly going to get ahead. That is my opinion and I will stick to it."

3. It is essential to the future welfare of the Navy that top Navy and Department of Defense management attention be placed on increasing the stature and authority of the technical groups charged with the responsibility of executing the Navy's technical work.

"If the current assumption that this work can be successfully turned over to industry is allowed to endure, the Navy will soon find itself exhausting its energy and finances to patch up the unsuccessful technical products it will receive from a loosely-controlled industry."

4. Another matter which bears directly on the problems of poor quality and high cost of our new and complex weapon systems is the lack of permanence of personnel.

For example, a survey of naval shipyards engaged in nuclear propulsion work showed that over a period of 18 years, one of the top three people—the shipyard commander who runs the shipyard, the planning officer who is in charge of all design work and cost estimating, and the production officer who is in charge of all construction—was replaced on an average of every six months in every one of those shipyards.

RAPID CHANGEOVER

Further, not one of those people in any yard held his job for more than four years, and even four years was a rare case. Said Rickover, "I don't think you can run a sophisticated technical business that way."

5. With specific regard to naval shipyards, the admiral recommends:

An immediate reduction at several of the yards of about 10 per cent of the workers—"the non-producers"—which, he believes could lead to increased efficiency. "I have visited the shipyards," said Rickover, "and I have observed the vast amounts of unproductive labor, and I have so reported this to the shipyard commanders and to the commander, Naval Ship Systems Command."

Relieving shipyard commanders of their military duties, such as area co-ordination, base commander, and public relations, which "take up most of their time to the detriment of their primary task. They then would devote their efforts only to the technical and production aspects of the yard."

Rickover concluded, "I see no point in Congress appropriating more than half our taxes for military purposes and not devoting time to seeing whether the money is properly spent. It is like giving a vaccination and not bothering to find out whether the vaccination has taken."

ACTIVE PROTAGONIST

Admiral Rickover is convinced that Congress "will have to become an active protagonist in overhauling the defense procurement process," which now has "many deficiencies and loopholes," because the Department of Defense has been greatly influenced by the industry viewpoint . . .

Among other reforms in this process the admiral would like to see:

Uniform standards of accounting so that actual costs and profits can be readily determined, thus providing a sound basis for contracting;

Application of the rules of non-competitive procurement to all contracts that are not formally advertised procurements.

(During the period 1951-67, the Defense Department negotiated 86.1 per cent of the net value of its procurements, despite the clear congressional intent that procurements be made through formal, written competitive bid procedures.)

CENTRAL FILE

Establishment of a central government file on contractor experience, showing for each contractor such items as his actual delivery performance, exorbitant or unfounded claims he has submitted, the difference between original and final price of each contract performed, and the amount of excessive profit he has realized on government work.

Admiral Rickover concluded, "What I have said is essentially no different than what I have been saying for years in the Navy and to Congress. However, I am convinced that it will take a major catastrophe before anything is done . . ."

On May 15, there was a major catastrophe.

THE WASTED DEFENSE DOLLAR—II: COMEDY OF ERRORS SINKS ATOMIC SUB

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—At 8:55 p.m., May 15, the nuclear-powered attack submarine Guitarro sank while tied up to the dock at the Mare

Island site of the San Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard.

The submarine had been under construction since August 1965 and was due to be commissioned in January 1970. It was re-floated on May 18 and, after inspection, damages were estimated at between \$15.2 million and \$21.85 million.

A congressional subcommittee, headed by Rep. Samuel S. Stratton, D-N.Y., went to Mare Island, took 605 pages of testimony, under oath, from witnesses deemed most knowledgeable as to facts bearing on the sinking, and concluded that immediate cause of the catastrophe was "the culpable negligence of certain shipyard employees."

SLOPPY ORGANIZATION

Interviewed by The Standard-Times, Stratton commented, "The Mare Island organization under the admiral was sloppy, and he probably was not even aware of it. It was shoddy management."

Asked if the same thing could happen again, the congressman replied, "Congress can go only so far. Then it becomes an executive branch matter."

What the testimony taken at Mare Island reveals would be as unbelievably amusing as a French farce, except that, for want of the timely exercise of very little common sense and the taking of a few simple precautions, it concerns the wasting of millions of taxpayer dollars.

Moreover, the element of incredible human error recalls Admiral Rickover's complaint that, "It must be realized that, under existing rules, it is most difficult for shipyard commanders to get rid of anyone for cause, no matter how bad the person is."

IMMEDIATE STEPS NEEDED

"If the Department of Defense is actually in earnest about improving the efficiency of our Navy yards, it should take immediate steps to alter and simplify the rules so that Navy Yard management will have the same freedom as private yards to improve worker efficiency."

This is what happened to Guitarro:

4 p.m.: A civilian construction group (nuclear) began an instrument calibration assignment which required the filling of certain tanks, located aft of the ship's pivot point, with approximately five tons of water.

4:30 p.m.: A civilian construction group (non-nuclear) began an assignment to bring the ship within a half degree of trim. This entailed the adding of water to tanks forward of the ship's pivot point, to overcome a reported two degree up-bow attitude.

From approximately 4:30 p.m. to 7:45 p.m., the nuclear group continued to add water aft, and the non-nuclear group continued to add water forward. Neither group knew what the other was doing, nor were they apparently aware of each other's presence.

WAVES INTO MANHOLE

At 7 p.m., and again at 7:30 p.m., a security watch advised the non-nuclear group that the Guitarro was riding so low forward that a 1½-foot wave action, stirred up by boats operating in the river, was causing water to enter an uncovered manhole in the most forward and lowest portion of the ship's deck. These warnings went unheeded.

The open manhole is noteworthy. Guitarro's sonar operation is dependent on a number of large electronic components known as transducers. Sometime after the sonar equipment was installed, it was discovered that some of these components were faulty and would have to be replaced. To facilitate this work, a 3½-foot high cofferdam and a bolted manhole cover that had protected the opening were removed.

This occurred in early March and neither the cofferdam nor the cover ever was replaced. At the same the Guitarro went down,

the manhole cover was on the dock and the cofferdam was in the storage warehouse.

Both the non-nuclear ship superintendent and the general foreman on the sub had a responsibility for protecting it from the threat posed by the open sonar dome manhole. The ship superintendent testified that the bolted manhole cover should not have remained off without a cofferdam around the hole.

NEVER NOTICED

However, he further testified that, although he made daily inspection of the Guitarro, he never noticed the uncovered sonar dome manhole and that no one ever brought the matter to his attention. In view of the fact this dangerous condition existed for two months before the sinking, this is an incredible bit of testimony.

A cofferdam could have been installed easily and quickly but the general foreman testified that, although he recognized the open manhole as a potential threat to the safety of the ship, he felt a sufficiently close watch of it was being maintained and, therefore, there was no need for a cofferdam. Unfortunately, no one was watching the night the Guitarro sank.

The swing-shift foreman, who was assigned the work of trimming the sub to correct a reported bow-down attitude, testified that he had never before attempted to trim a ship and did not feel qualified to do so. Moreover, although he was told that Guitarro was bow down, he had it checked by one of his workers, who reported the bow up two degrees, rather than down at all.

Obviously, someone was seriously in error and accumulated evidence suggests it is not beyond possibility that both the day shift and swing shift measurements were in error and that, as a matter of fact, the submarine actually was in trim and needed no adjustment of attitude at all.

As time went on, the non-nuclear group in the forward part of the ship was not having much success in reducing the up-bow attitude believed to exist. Presumably, this was due, at least in part, to the fact that the nuclear group was pouring several tons of water into the tanks aft.

So the non-nuclear group—since moving water to the forward trim tanks had not produced the desired result—decided to put water in the forward ballast tanks. What this operation means can best be understood from this comment by a submariner with extensive experience in submarine construction and operation: "To put water into a main ballast tank, to a person in submarines, is—you don't do this unless you want to submerge, or unless it is a very deliberate, controlled evolution."

7:45 p.m.: The non-nuclear group stopped adding water to the ballast tanks in preparation for their lunch break.

7:50 p.m.: The nuclear group completed their calibrating assignment and began to empty the tanks aft.

8 p.m.: The non-nuclear group left for lunch.

SUDDEN DOWN ANGLE

8:30 p.m.: The nuclear group completed emptying the water from the after tanks and a member of the group noticed "a sudden down angle being taken by the boat. At approximately the same time, the non-nuclear group and others, returning to the ship for lunch, observed it down sharply at the bow, with massive flooding taking place through several large open hatches.

8:30 to 8:45 p.m.: Efforts made to close watertight doors and hatches were unsuccessful due to lines and cables running through them.

8:55 p.m.: The Guitarro sank.

The evidence suggests that the relatively rapid emptying of the tanks aft was the

final straw which tipped the bow the last fraction of an inch needed for rapid flooding of the sonar dome.

It also appears that, by flooding the forward ballast tanks, the submarine was put in a dive posture and that what it eventually did, therefore, was precisely what it had been designed to do—submerge.

NO CENTRAL CONTROL

What seems to have been principally lacking at Mare Island was centralized control and responsibility for all construction. A memorandum dated March 27 describes a meeting held on March 15 at which Guitarro's prospective commanding officer urged creation of a Mare Island agency that would fulfill this function. According to the memorandum, the suggestion was opposed by the shipyard representatives.

One enlightening paragraph of that memorandum reads: "CO 665 (the prospective commanding officer) pointed out the need for a central controlling agency in the non-nuclear construction areas of the ship. Shipyard representatives (Lampson and Sheldon) pointed out the fact that the shipyard had been in business for a long time without the need for such a procedure and no one had been killed or equipment damaged yet. CO 665 replied that they had been lucky."

On May 15, the shipyard's luck ran out. Mr. Stratton's subcommittee recommended that the Secretary of the Navy take "immediate action" to establish and enforce clearcut lines of responsibility at all construction yards, and to instruct the Naval Ship Systems Command to "undertake an immediate and thorough survey of the construction practices and procedures in effect at all Navy shipyards . . ."

HARD TO CHANGE

Yet there is evidence that even the catastrophe of which Admiral Rickover warned, and which Guitarro represented, may not be sufficient to inject into the military-industrial relationship those relatively simple elements of communication, authority and responsibility necessary to prevent another "Guitarro." Change comes hard.

"What disturbs me most now," said Mr. Stratton, who holds the rank of captain in the Naval Reserve, "is that we had the commander of the Ship Systems Command before the committee the other day (Rear Admiral Edward J. Fahy), and he didn't give me a very satisfactory answer as to what they were doing, if anything, about our recommendations. I am not aware that they have, in fact, done anything about them."

"What happened at Mare Island was that no one person was in charge of the ship and responsible for it. Congress can ride herd on the executive, can point out that a situation like this needs to be corrected, but I can't see what legislative action needs to be taken, and we can't perform an executive function."

THE WASTED DEFENSE DOLLAR—III: CRAFTSMANSHIP LOST ART?

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—On July 14, Dr. Jacques Piccard began a 1,500-mile submerged drift, Florida to Massachusetts, in the midjet sub Ben Franklin, to study characteristics of the northward-flowing Gulf Stream.

Within the first three days, almost half of the scientific equipment aboard, provided by the U.S. Navy, was out of operation.

(The Ben Franklin is expected to surface today at a point about 300 miles southeast of Cape Cod, after drifting for nearly four weeks.)

Captain T. K. Treadwell, commander, U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office, commenting on failure of the oceanographic instrumentation that reduced scientific effectiveness of this \$10-\$15 million project by 50 percent, sug-

gested as much as two-thirds of the gear might not work properly by the time the trip was ended.

TEMPERS CRITICISM

Nevertheless, Captain Treadwell's criticism of the industry that supplies Navy oceanographic equipment is tempered by several factors.

In an exclusive interview with The Standard-Times, he philosophized about the \$10-\$15 million a year spent by his office annually that makes the Navy the nation's largest purchaser of oceanographic instrumentation. It buys half of all the instruments in this field sold in the country.

He said, "There is nothing unique about either oceanographic instrumentation or nuclear subs. We face the same problem with cars, television sets and refrigerators. There is a general lessening of care and morality in production, an absence of the kind of craftsmanship we used to have. It is observable throughout most of our manufacturing industry.

"If we could just bring back some of the pride in craftsmanship, the element of responsibility that we used to have, most of the necessary improvements in quality could be achieved at no cost. It takes no more time to run a good solder joint than it does a cold solder joint that won't hold. A properly threaded nut takes the same length of time to tighten as a cross-threaded nut."

NEED MORAL REVOLUTION

But in the absence of such a moral revolution in manufacturing, Captain Treadwell turns to more immediately practical approaches.

In his view, "What really hurts is that we deal in small quantities. Ten items is a large run. We cannot have the routine checks that are practical in assembly-line runs of such mass-produced articles as television sets and automobiles. Our items must be hand-done, one-of-a-kind things that are individually checked, and this costs money."

Money may be the answer that is most practical, he suggests.

"Admiral Rickover suggests tighter specifications and closer supervision," Treadwell commented, and although we have gone somewhat in that direction, it poses a question.

"If you're going to put a man on the moon, you can't afford error, so you reduce the meantime between failures of components to an infinitesimal minimum, but you pay dearly for it. What we have to ask ourselves in oceanography—and presumably in other government procurement areas where such of life, are involved—is how much is reliability worth?

BALANCE COST AND NEEDS

"In our field, we have to weigh such values as the \$5,000-a-day cost of operating a ship and intangibles such as having to wait for data. We have to strike a balance between higher quality control and higher costs, as compared with more assured performance and operations. Lunar modules and nuclear subs are examples of items in which quality is worth any price that it costs.

"It is not the same with oceanographic instrumentation, although I think we can spend a lot more on quality control. It looks as if we could reasonably spend 25-50 percent more for hardware without pricing ourselves out of the market; we would still be ahead, because of greater assurance of performance, even at that level."

The money to purchase better products is, of course, not necessarily available; at present, Navy oceanographers teeter in their procurement between buying a few better instruments, and many of lesser quality, attempting to keep going as broad a program as possible.

Treadwell thinks the situation is improving, in considerable measure, because of the National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center's (a relatively new federal unit for testing U.S.-purchased equipment) "strong campaign." He said, "They are convincing manufacturers that they must turn out quality products and price them at what quality costs and that if they do not, we'll return the products. It's working."

Consequently, he believes that NOIC should be more broadly applied in government procurement. Recent nationalization of the testing agency is a step in this direction and its facilities now are available to other government facets—for example, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

NOT OUR OWN MASTERS

He also commented that:

1. "We are not our own masters in choosing contractors. We are required to give a certain percentage of work to small business, to depressed areas. I recall a particularly unfortunate example—a major ship contract awarded to a bicycleshop operation that went bankrupt, leaving three or four rusting, half-completed vessels and a lot of litigation.

2. "The necessity of accepting the low bid often overrides our better judgment. Astronaut John Glenn, at the lift-off of his historic triple orbit of the earth in 1962, is supposed to have reflected: 'Every component was purchased at the lowest competitive price.'"

3. "In the cases of perhaps one out of four companies to which we have to allocate business, we have serious misgivings as to whether they can perform at all, or at the estimated price. In the latter case, we know well that many companies underbid purposely, figuring on making it up on cost-plus programs."

4. "There ought to be some flexibility in the low-bid principle, and on the economic factors that pressure us to place contracts in certain areas. The principles are helpful, but we balk at not being able to override a decision if it appears to us likely to lead to catastrophic result."

SMALL COMPANIES RELIABLE

5. "Some of our best equipment comes from small companies. There's less to check, and the boss's eye is everywhere."

6. "We're moving away from the cost-plus contract. It's an open invitation to underbidding and cost overrunning. We're trying now for fixed-fee contracts or cost plus an incentive fee, with the 'plus' depending on how well the contractor does the work."

Captain Treadwell believes that oceanography is at a turning point because "we are beginning to stress its practical applications" and that this factor necessarily will force an upgrading in the reliability of oceanographic equipment.

He said, "From now on, we are not concerned with a trained technician, who can make inferior equipment work. We are increasingly concerned with merchant marine officers, fishing skippers, and untrained workers in military service operations who require reliability of instrumentation."

RELIABILITY NEEDED

"For example, in introducing science into the fishing fleet, which now is happening, we must make the scientific tools as reliable, and as accident-prone as the sextant."

"There is an economic incentive for the manufacturer in striving for this kind of quality for only in producing items for the lay user is he going to find a mass market. There probably are a hundred fishing skippers for every scientist, and what the fisherman demands for a scientific supporting tool is a rugged, simple piece of hardware."

"That is the direction in which we must go."

THE WASTED DEFENSE DOLLAR—IV: HALF OF OCEANOGRAPHIC GEAR FAULTY

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—Oceanographic equipment purchased by the U.S. Navy has a failure rate of from 35 to 50 per cent, according to the National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center at the Navy Yard here.

These figures include only "catastrophic" failure; that is, something so expensive that the Navy cannot afford to repair it. In such cases, NOIC returns the equipment to the manufacturer with recommendations on how to fix it, at his own expense.

If the "catastrophic" yardstick were not used, if instead, every failure of equipment tested, for whatever cause, were included, the failure rate would "approach 100 per cent."

I asked a NOIC spokesman "Are you saying that every piece of oceanographic equipment you test here has something wrong with it that prevents it from doing what its manufacturer said it would?"

"Yes," he replied, "either a repair or an adjustment is necessary; for the most part, something that should be done, or should have been done by the manufacturer."

He added, "Personally, I think any failure, for major or minor cause, is 'catastrophic' if it prevents you from using the instrument."

NOIC, initially a Navy operation and only recently nationalized, is unique in the military-industrial relationship but the indications are that its function—testing equipment to spot poor quality—ought to be broadly emulated in government.

\$250,000 PER MONTH

This agency examines \$250,000 worth of oceanographic equipment per month, and an official commented, "I would hate to think how much defective gear the Navy accepted before we began this operation four years ago. Frankly, all of it may have been defective."

Moreover, NOIC publishes a widely distributed fact sheet identifying the equipment tested, and noting its failures, whether or not the manufacturer decides to make its recommended repairs or improvements. This is creating a new atmosphere of healthy skepticism summed up by one NOIC staff member who remarked, "We're just saying, 'Don't necessarily believe the performance claims in the manufacturer's brochure.'"

Involved in this testing are products created by fewer than 100 companies, supplying government oceanographic needs in a relatively non-competitive situation.

The equipment failure rate is increasing, officials agree, but they differ as to the reason.

One official suggested it is because the instrumentation required is more complicated. He said that "practically all the companies" supplying this type of gear to the Navy would "be dropped" if it were policy to exclude firms that had had one or more failures in their product.

UNIQUE REQUIREMENTS

But in defending industry, he added that the government has "unique requirements, special demands," and the manufacturer has limited research and development capabilities.

Referring to companies that repeatedly produce a poor product, he said, "Part of this is due to lack of official continuity. The people who evaluate a company's ability to produce are not responsible for its capability or output if it gets a contract. The people who must use the equipment are not the ones who decide whether the company is capable of making it."

An interesting development is the fact that the NOIC program is generally acceptable to industry, which finds its tests and recommendations helpful in the improvement of product, and which, in the words of one engineer, "usually is willing to take a piece

of gear back 100 times when we tell them what's wrong with it, and what they ought to do about it."

NOIC, with an annual budget of \$1.3 million and a staff of 60, undoubtedly is saving thousands of dollars, breakdowns and loss of man-hours. Could this Navy-oriented program be generally applied to the military-industrial relationship, with resultant benefit to taxpayers and the military?

WOULDN'T ACCEPT

Replied the NOIC spokesman with a wry smile: "It would be murder all the way for the other services," presumably meaning that neither the military (the Defense Department) nor major industry would accept it.

It is only fair to note that the military's more sophisticated demands are not wholly responsible for the oceanographic equipment failure rate.

One Navy Oceanographic Office staff member offered these comments and examples:

1. Much workmanship is "pathetic" because of lack of industry quality control and it has been "sliding downhill" in recent years. Item: Long screws instead of short screws were furnished with a salinity and depth measuring device. When tightened, they "cut right through the plastic coating on the capacitors, and blew up the whole power supply."

2. Fifteen per cent of companies supplying Navy oceanographic equipment have a "consistently low performance rate, but we have to take the low bidder even if we know he can't perform."

3. Instruction manuals, "never updated," frequently are behind the model of the equipment produced.

LATE DELIVERY

4. A measuring system, part of a \$440,000 contract was nine months late in delivery. When it arrived, it was damaged, because it had been improperly packed, and the units had to be returned. Three months later, the factory returned one of the units, with parts missing. Later, the parts were supplied upon request, but manuals for assembly and usage still have not arrived, and "this gear is supposed to go on a ship in two weeks." Considering that it costs the Navy \$4,000-\$5,000 per day to operate a ship, this fiasco represents a lot of working ship-days lost.

Incidentally, a unit of this system—characterized by poor workmanship—was run for one week, at the end of which time it was "completely inoperative."

5. Said the staff member, "I went to one plant that we buy from. I looked at the gear and said 'You ought to reject these items.' A plant supervisor said to me, 'I could reject them this morning, and they'd be turned back to me by my supervisors for shipment by tonight.'"

On another occasion, the Navy staffer said, "At one company, I looked at 18 current meters that were ready to roll down the line on their way to the Navy. I rejected all of them, for bad solder connections, after they had been OK'd by the company representative. I think good quality control could knock down our rejection rate to maybe 10 per cent."

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS

The following are excerpts from letters written by NOIC to manufacturers supplying oceanographic equipment to the Navy:

"Before an acceptance test of the unit could be performed, these actions had to be accomplished:

"1. The gearing in the depth channel of the recorder was very noisy and had to be adjusted;

"2. The guide rod that supports the chart paper was loose in the case and had to be reinstalled and secured in place;

"3. The gears in the salinity channel were not meshing; these had to be readjusted;

"4. The cabling for the sensor input con-

nections in the rear of the recorder were reversed and improperly marked as listed in the instruction manual."

And in a second letter:

"The regulated power supply was lying loose inside of the cabinet. This was due to the holding brackets breaking loose;

"The continuous balance unit has one holding bracket broken loose.

"The bracket holding the toroid is bent.

"The machine screws for fastening the power supply and the continuous balance chassis were found loose in the bottom of the cabinet.

"The holding bracket for the power supply was broken loose.

"The holding flange on the continuous balance chassis is bent.

"The socket for the converter on the continuous balance unit is broken loose and damaged."

And in a third letter, "The (equipment) was received damaged because the crate was not marked 'Handle in horizontal position' although it was clearly intended to be handled that way."

And the fourth letter was from a manufacturer to the Navy: "Please forgive our oversight in failing to complete calibration tables provided with the equipment you ordered." This was in response to an NOIC complaint.

"This sort of thing is frequent," commented the staff member. "It goes on all the time, and as small, new companies come into the field, attracted by the increased amount of oceanographic funds available, the rate of equipment failure is bound to go up."

THE WASTED DEFENSE DOLLAR—V: HOUSE UNIT HAS REMEDY

(By Everett S. Allen)

WASHINGTON.—The House Committee on Government Operations on Aug. 6, approved a bill that could transform practices and policies of the federal government's \$50-billion-a-year procurement program.

Essentially, the measure, H.R. 474, proposes establishment of a federal commission on procurement, patterned after the so-called "Hoover Commissions." These latter, consisting of members of the House and Senate, plus outside experts, were established for the purpose of studying operations of the Executive Branch and making recommendations for improvement to the Congress.

Due to the congressional recess, there will be no opportunity for House floor action until after Labor Day, assuming the Rules Committee clears the bill.

The architect of H.R. 474 is California Democrat Chet Holifield, who, as a 17-year member of the House Military Operations Subcommittee, has long been concerned with armed services procurement procedures, which amount to at least 65-70 per cent of total procurement funds spent.

HEARINGS CONDUCTED

Mr. Holifield, now chairman of the subcommittee, for two years has been conducting hearings on his bill and the parade of civilian and military witnesses—a virtual Who's Who of the Capitol and Pentagon—has contributed expert testimony filling five published volumes.

In an interview with The Standard-Times, Mr. Holifield who was a House member of the second Hoover Commission, predicted that the Operations Committee would report favorably on his measure, that it will be passed by the House before the end of this session of Congress, and added, "It is possible it also will pass the Senate in this session; if not, it will be on the agenda for 1970 action by that chamber. I am confident it will become law before the end of the 91st Congress."

The commission proposed by H.R. 474 dif-

fers from the Hoover Commissions in two respects. First, its role would be confined to a study of procurement only—in Mr. Holifield's words, "the many methods by which government dollars are transferred to private industry."

Second, in addition to members from the House, Senate and civilian sector, it would include as a working member the comptroller general of the United States.

This is because the comptroller is the administrative head of the General Accounting Office, which has the function of making post-audit investigations of government expenditures, with a view toward standardizing and improving the federal systems of accounting and bookkeeping.

FIFTY REORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Holifield, who as chairman of a government operations sub-committee has "handled more than 50 presidential reorganization plans, most of which became law," noted that GAO and its 6,000-7,000 skilled investigators, accountants and lawyers are "looked upon as an arm of Congress, and are answerable to us, rather than the Executive."

He feels that without GAO's help, the Congress would be largely helpless in this area, because "it fills the deficiency gap which Congress is responsible for in not developing a large, competent staff for each committee."

The Californian believes, as does Admiral Rickover, that "it is basically the responsibility of Congress that efficiency obtain in the Executive Branch." He referred to the 1946 Reorganization Act, which directs each committee of Congress to oversee the application of laws it passes, and to oversee the agencies within the committee's jurisdiction, for the purpose of observing the efficiency and economy of the Executive operation.

Commented Mr. Holifield, "This is a basic operational responsibility of Congress. Principally, the committees of Congress have failed to perform this job of oversight which Congress' own laws require it to do."

EFFORT MADE

"An effort is being made, but the effort is not enough, nor have the committees equipped themselves with adequate staff to do the continuous job of oversight."

It has been suggested that the post-audit function of GAO should be enlarged to include running audits or current scrutiny of programs of procurement in the Executive Branch. Mr. Holifield commented, "In my opinion this step will be taken before very long."

(On Aug. 7, the Senate voted to make major Pentagon contracts for weapons subject to the independent scrutiny of the General Accounting Office. The action was taken by a one-vote margin over the strenuous opposition of the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, John C. Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi.)

(To amount to more than a symbolic assertion of the congressional control over the Pentagon this action, sponsored by Sen. Richard S. Schweiker, Republican, of Pennsylvania will have to be approved by the House, but there the Armed Services Committee, which will oppose it, is more generally influential with the membership.)

"The committees of Congress are calling on the GAO much more often for the purpose of investigating multi-year procurement programs while they are in operation, rather than waiting, as heretofore, to post-audit the programs after they are completed," Mr. Holifield added.

Specifically with regard to military procurement, the veteran West Coast lawmaker made these points:

1. Military procurement problems are further complicated by the fact that men in uniform can overrule decisions which the Civil Service personnel in their departments—who have more continuity of service and more experience—have made;

LESS ROTATION

2. The Military Operations subcommittee repeatedly has recommended that there be a cadre of "in-house" military people who are not subject to rotation, but who are retained in a department of procurement, being given for that service the same periodic promotions as those who are rotated.

"Until this is done," said Hollifield, "we will never have the efficiency we should have in Department of Defense procurement."

"As we get into more complex and technical fields of defense hardware, it becomes more necessary than ever that we develop top-caliber expertise in buying. To develop this requires training in the scientific disciplines involved even to the point of having scientific degrees. It requires expert engineering capability and specialized business and fiscal training."

"What I am essentially advocating is that government procurement personnel have the same time of specialized training which obtains in comparable positions in the business world," the West Coast legislator concluded.

MARYLAND MARINE KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. George F. Bonnett, a fine young man from Maryland was recently killed in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 27, 1969]

MASS SCHEDULED TOMORROW FOR BONNETT, VIET CASUALTY

A requiem mass for Lance Cpl. George F. Bonnett, a Baltimore marine who died of wounds received while leading a patrol in Vietnam, will be offered at 9 A.M. tomorrow in St. Dominic's Church, Hartford road and Gibbons avenue.

Corporal Bonnett, who was 19, was seriously wounded August 12 while leading a reconnaissance patrol. Corporal Bonnett's parents received a telegram last Sunday informing them that their son died August 16.

Corporal Bonnett was born in Baltimore and attended Archbishop Curley High School. He enlisted in the Marines a month after he graduated in June, 1968.

He received basic training at Parris Island, S.C., and parachute and reconnaissance training at Camp Lejeune, N.C., and Fort Benning, Ga. He was sent to Vietnam in January.

Corporal Bonnett was fluent in French, and received special training last May in the Vietnamese language. He was in the Marine Corp's Combined Action Program, in which he helped instruct Vietnamese soldiers.

In a letter written in February to his sister, Mrs. Irene Mogavero, Corporal Bonnett expressed the hope that the war would end before his nephews were of age.

Corporal Bonnett wrote: "It's not a pleasant experience seeing a man torn apart by a bullet or a fragment of a mine; it's not fun to take what's left of your friend and let him lay there until the chopper comes."

"I hope they never have to see or feel or experience what I have. It opens your eyes to reality. You're lucky to be alive and in the U.S."

"But, on the other hand, there will always be a Vietnam somewhere, someplace, and always a universal soldier."

Besides his sister, Corporal Bonnett's survivors include his parents, Mr. and Mrs.

Jacob W. Bonnett, of Baltimore, and five brothers, Staff Sgt. James H. Bonnett, USAF (Ret.), John H. Bonnett, Jacob W. Bonnett and Dennis Bonnett, all of Baltimore, and SK 1 William R. Bonnett, USN, of Washington.

MY DOMAIN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very impressive and imaginative description of our great land written by the Fox College Creative Writing Class has just come to my attention and I insert it into the RECORD at this point as an example of the pride and healthy appreciation that Americans should have for our country. The description speaks for itself, as follows:

MY DOMAIN

In my domain, I have the greatest art collection in the history of mankind. I can say that someone knows and practices the art of basket-weaving, of tuning a piano, or even hitting a home run. In my domain there are many arts—as many as there are kinds of deliberate, specialized activities in which one may engage.

In my libraries, I have more books than were printed in the entire history of the world, up until the nineteenth century.

I have forest preserves and parks greater than most of the kingdoms of ancient, medieval, yes—and modern times.

Noah was a piker! Noah had two members of every specie of every animal known to man. I have a dozen of every specie. Why I have hundreds of every specie in my domain.

In my preserves I have hundreds of thousands of ducks—Mallards, Pintails, the green and the blue-winged Teal. Canadian Honkers arrive every fall in gigantic formations—by the thousands. In my southern preserves are the most beautiful of all birds—an extravaganza in color.

I have trees now growing in my forests that were growing when Christ walked the Earth. Why I have glaciers sliding down to the seas that have been sliding for millions of years.

I have thousands of miles of rivers, seashores, lakes—beautiful lakes of unknown numbers—waterfalls, and mountains of forests.

My holdings overlook the giants in industry, education, and commerce—millions of fertile square miles, wheatlands, coal mines, and steel plants. It fairly makes me burst with pride.

My domain stretches from the rock-bound coast of Maine, past the sunny strands of California, to the golden beaches of Waikiki, from the frozen tundras of Alaska, to the Florida Everglades.

My schools are the greatest, my churches are the grandest! That's my domain.

Always—my Community Newspapers accentuate the positive.

The vast majority of my people are industrious, upright, honest, and hard working. They have the qualities and characteristics that have made my domain the greatest in the world.

You should see my western wonderland—the home of the geyser, the glacier and the Grand Canyon. You should feel the abysmal loneliness of Padre Island and visit Aransas Pass—the home of the Whooping Crane. Stand with me in the Alamo, ride through the Cumberland Gap, travel the Skyway to Valley Forge and Independence Hall. Weep with me at the foot of Lincoln's Monument.

Proudly watch the guard in measured step honoring The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier—eternally.

I want you all to come visit my domain. Make yourself at home. You hear? Treat it as though it were your very own, because it is—you know! God Bless America!

THE LITERATURE OF CAMPUS CONFLICT

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the current concern about conflict on our campuses and about unrest and alienation in our young people is a marked increase in the literature on the subject.

Recently, in the San Francisco Chronicle, one of my constituents, Mr. Claude Ury, reviewed four books on this important subject. I think that these reviews will be of interest to the Congress and I include them in the RECORD at this point:

STUDENT CONFLICT, STRATEGY, A SHOW OF POWER

(Reviewed by Claude M. Ury)

(Book reviews: "Conflict of Generations," by Lewis Feuer. Basic Books; \$12.50; "Confrontation on Campus," the Columbia Pattern for the New Protest. By Joanne Grant. New American Library (paperback, 95 cents); "Students Without Teachers," the Crisis in the University. By Harold Taylor. McGraw-Hill; \$7.95; "Student Power," Problems, Diagnosis and Action. Edited by Alexander Cockburn and Robin Blackburn. Penguin Books (paperback, \$1.25).)

Confrontation in the colleges across the nation are becoming more frequent and increasingly militant. They are no longer merely demonstrations for demands; they are also a show of power. Common characteristics of these rebellions since Columbus include occupation of buildings, the involvement of community people, fighting police, reluctance to negotiate. This last has had the anticipated effect of genuine confrontation—that is, the power of the students versus the power of the trustees and of putting professors up against the wall.

Feuer's book is the most definitive study on student movements. He surveys student movements in more than 20 nations, with particular attention to Russia, Bosnia and Germany in the 19th Century and Japan and the United States in the 20th.

"The pattern is the same in practically every country," said Feuer, who is Professor of Sociology at the University of Toronto.

"The movement, is rooted in altruism, a concern for establishing community and overcoming alienation. It begins by celebrating liberal democratic values and usually ends by discrediting those values for the whole society."

The movements, Feuer said, are typically led by young men who have had particular problems with their fathers.

"You can see this," he went on, "in one movement after another"; Karl Follen, the key figure in the Prussian movement; Gavrilo Princip, who assassinated the archduke, down to Mao Tse-Tung and leaders of American movements.

"These leaders read out to students in whom the problem is more attenuated. Then at some crisis—let's say the arrival of police on campus—the leaders appeal to generational solidarity and the struggle is finally revealed in its aspect."

The Grant volume assesses in great detail the events leading to the Columbia protest

and compares it to other student revolts nationwide.

Before Columbia the pattern of taking buildings had been established in several other schools beginning with the Berkeley Free Speech Movement at the University of California in 1964. At that time most observers tended to view the demonstrations as a Berkeley problem and to analyze the causes as related to that institution. Since then each campus outburst has been seen as peculiar to the campus on which it occurred.

At Columbia the students attempted to force the faculty as a whole to take a stand, but succeeded only in the lesser goal of exposing the faculty as unable or unwilling to separate itself from the institution and the faculty's stake in it.

THE REVOLUTION

Taylor's book is about the student revolution—how it started, what it means, and where it is going. With a sense of reasoned urgency, Taylor argues that students in the United States and abroad are major agents of social change, and that the universities must be reformed in ways which can give to student talents and energies a chance for expression in political, social, and cultural action. At present, the students are without teachers to whom they can give their loyalty, respect, and trust. They have accordingly turned to one another for the intellectual and moral leadership they fail to find in the university and the social system it represents.

After describing the character and history of the student movement, the author analyzes the relations between the mass culture and the educational elites, the nature of the present university crisis, the causes of student unrest, and the philosophy of education now dominant in American institutions of learning. He urges a return to progressivism in educational thought and action. The longest section of the book, the Reform of Mass Education, presents a series of concrete recommendations for reforming the system of teaching and learning to restore a sense of purpose and relevance to the work and students and teachers in the schools and colleges.

Taylor cites the instrument of educational change developed by San Francisco State College students in their experimental college with the result that the curriculum of the entire institution has been enriched.

The Cockburn and Blackburn study, published in cooperation with the New Left Review, examines the real nature and international implications of student activism in Britain. Students have piecemeal grievances over discipline, examinations and grants. What is wrong with established student organizations? How does the student differ in

the established universities, in art colleges and in teacher training colleges? And most important since students are often accused of fomenting anarchy, what is the strategy for the future?

CONGRESS CAN HELP SAVE THE BAY AND DELTA

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 8, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the popular effort to protect and preserve San Francisco Bay, its estuary, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta from probable ecological disaster by the planned diversion of some 80 percent of this system's normal fresh water inflows is gaining widespread support and publicity.

Instrumental in this effort is the effective contribution of the area press. An example of that support is an excellent editorial that appeared in the August 26, 1969, edition of the Antioch Ledger of California.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to enter this editorial, "Congress Can Help Save the Delta," in the RECORD for the edification of the Members of Congress:

CONGRESS CAN HELP SAVE THE DELTA

Contra Costa County's fight to preserve the quality of Delta waters is a long, complicated battle, but it appears that momentum may be picking up.

The recently concluded Congressional Committee hearings are just a small chapter in the long saga, but they could well prove to be a significant turning point.

When the Committee on Conservation and Natural Resources studies all the testimony before it and comes up with a recommendation, we expect them to reasonably decide that there must be more safeguards to the Delta before the Peripheral Canal is built.

We expect that the testimony of oceanographers, marine biologists, and other water experts will override the obviously conflicting testimony of William Gianelli, director of the Department of Water Resources.

The committee, and Congress as a whole, is in a better position to assess the situation in the Delta than Gianelli, or, frankly, Contra Costa County officials.

Let's face it, Gianelli, if given a choice between fulfilling contracted water deliveries south and preserving the Delta, he would be expected to choose the former.

That's his job.

In the same light, Contra Costa County officials, if given the same choice, would elect to save the Delta and let the State Water Project fail.

It's our water.

We expect Congress can look at the problem from an over-all viewpoint, and demand a reasonable solution through its control over the federal purse-strings.

The over-riding principle in this water debate is that you may take excess waters from one area to help another.

No one will argue that we don't have excess waters. The flooding of Sherman Island is positive proof that there are years when Northern California has too much water.

But the application of this principle demands that you do not degrade the water of an area by shipping out anything but the excess water.

This is what the debate is about.

Contra Costa County has maintained that the Peripheral Canal can benefit the Delta waters if operated properly.

But the phrase "if operated properly" is the key.

The Peripheral Canal will not be "operated properly" if outflows of 1,800 cubic feet per second are used to maintain the quality of the Delta and San Francisco Bay waters.

The expert, impartial testimony bears that out, Gianelli's opinions to the contrary.

Yet it is exactly by those standards that the Peripheral Canal is proposed to be operated, as outlined in the 1965 Memorandum of Understanding.

Those standards may be raised after state hearings on water rights currently conducted in Sacramento are finished, but the balance of power, and the votes, in California rest in the southern part of the state.

We hope adequate water quality safeguards are established for our waters, so that the federal government will not have to do what the state should do for itself.

We do not think the State Water Project, with \$2.8 billion tied up already, should be stopped.

But if adequate safeguards are not adopted for the Delta, enforceable in court, then there appears to be no alternative but to halt the project by whatever means necessary.

And one of those means is the Congress refusing to participate in the destruction of the Bay-Delta water system by paying for half of the Peripheral Canal, as presently proposed.

SENATE—Tuesday, September 9, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, as on this day we offer our tribute of esteem and affection for our fallen colleague, Everett McKinley Dirksen, may Thy grace be sufficient for all our needs.

Surround all who are near and dear to him with ministries of comfort and healing. And to us give Thy peace.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its

reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen, late a Senator from the State of Illinois.

The message announced that the House has passed a bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (H.R. 7206) to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of Congress, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11039) to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DEATH OF SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate two resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 531

Resolved, That the House of Representatives accepts the invitation of the Senate to